1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 520 SOUTH 4TH STREET | SECOND FLOOR LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101 12 Tel. 702.384-5563 | Fax. 702.974-0623 CHRISTOPHER R. ORAM, LTD. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

* * * * *

TOYER EDWARDS

Appellant,

VS.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Respondent.

S.C. CASE NO. 82639

Electronically Filed Dec 10 2021 04:44 p.m. Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT THE HONORABLE JUDGE CARLI KIERNY, PRESIDING

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX TO THE OPENING BRIEF VOLUME IV

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT CHRISTOPHER R. ORAM, ESQ.

Attorney at Law Nevada Bar No. 004349 520 S. Fourth Street, 2nd Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: (702) 384-5563

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENT STEVE WOLFSON

STEVE WOLFSON District Attorney Nevada Bar No. 001565 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

AARON FORD Nevada Attorney General Nevada Bar No. 0003926 100 North Carson Street Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717

	1		IN THE SUPREME (COURT OF NEVADA	
	2	TOYER E	DWARDS	CASE NO. 82639	
	3		Appellant,		
	4	VS.			
	5	THE STAT	ΓΕ OF NEVADA,		
	6		Respondent.		
	7	-			_
	8		OPENING BR	IEF APPENDIX	
	9	VOLUME	PLEADING		PAGE NO
	10 11	5	AMENDED ORDER GRAN WRIT OF HABEAS CORPU	TING PETITIONER'S	
OOR	12		(FILED MARCH 12, 2021)		836-839
t, LTD. COND FLO 89101 12.974-062	13	5	CLERK'S CERTIFICATE (FILED DECEMBER 14, 20	018)	805-808
R. ORAN FREET SE NEVADA { FAX. 70	14	1	DEFENDANT'S PROPOSE (FILED FEBRUARY 23, 20	D JURY INSTRUCTIONS (18)	7-25
CHRISTOPHER R. ORAM, LTD. 520 SOUTH 4 TH STREET SECOND FLOOR LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101 TEL. 702.384-5563 FAX. 702.974-0623	15 16	5	DEFENDANT'S SENTENC (FILED MAY 04, 2018)	ING MEMORANDUM	773-778
Сні 520 SOU L. Тер 70	17	4	JURY INSTRUCTIONS	ENTAL PROPOSED	(50 (50
	18 19	4	(FILED MARCH 02, 2018) DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEM	ENTAL DDODOGED	652-658
	20	4	JURY INSTRUCTIONS (FILED MARCH 02, 2018)	ENTAL FROFOSED	659-665
	21	1	INFORMATION (FILED JULY 06, 2017)		1-3
	2223	4	INSTRUCTIONS TO THE . (FILED MARCH 02, 2018)	JURY	666-700
	24	5	JUDGMENT OF CONVICT (FILED MAY 22, 2018)	TION	795-796
	2526	5	NOTICE OF APPEAL (FILED OCTOBER 29, 201	8)	797-802
	27	5	NOTICE OF APPEAL (FILED MARCH 17, 2021)		840-841
	28	5	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF OR (FILED DECEMBER 13, 20)	RDER 019)	842-846

	1 2	5	NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER (FILED MARCH 17, 2021)	842-846
	3	5	ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL (FILED NOVEMBER 16, 2018)	803-804
	4 5	5	ORDER GRANTING PETITIONER'S WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS	920 921
	6	5	(FILED DECEMBER 11, 2019) PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS	829-831
	7		(POST-CONVICTION) (FILED APRIL 25, 2019)	812-823
	8 9	5	REMITTITUR (FILED DECEMBER 31, 2018)	809-811
	10	1	STATE'S NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK PUNISHMENT AS A HABITUAL CRIMINAL (FILED AUGUST 02, 2017)	4-6
D. 5 Floor 1 4-0623	11 12	5	STATE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS (FILED OCTOBER 02, 2019)	824-828
CHRISTOPHER R. ORAM, LTD. 20 SOUTH 4 TH STREET SECOND FLOOR LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101 TEL. 702.384-5563 FAX. 702.974-0623	13 14	5	STATE'S SENTENCING MEMORANDUM (FILED APRIL 24, 2018)	703-772
STOPHER TH 4 TH STR S VEGAS, N 384-5563	15 16	1	STIPULATION AND ORDER (FILED FEBRUARY 26, 2018)	26-28
СНR J 520 SOUT LAS ТЕL. 702.	17 18	1	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: JURY TRIAL – DAY 1 of 5 FEBRUARY 26, 2018 (FILED APRIL 14, 2021)	29-200
	19	2	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE:	27 200
	20		JURY TRIAL – DAY 2 of 5 FEBRUARY 27, 2018 (FILED APRIL14, 2021)	201-317
	21 22	3	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: JURY TRIAL – DAY 3 of 5	
	23		FEBRUARY 28, 2018 (FILED APRIL 14, 2021)	318-457
	2425	4	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: JURY TRIAL – DAY 4 of 5 MARCH 01, 2018	
	26		(FILED APŘIL 14, 2021)	458-545
	27	4	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: JURY TRIAL – DAY 5 of 5 MARCH 02, 2015	
	28		(FILED APŘIL 14, 2021)	546-651

	1	5 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE:
	2	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: SENTENCING MAY 10, 2018 (FILED APRIL 14, 2021) 779-794
	3	4 VERDICT
	4	(FILED MARCH 02, 2018) 701-702
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
	10	
	11	
). Floor -0623	12	
CHRISTOPHER R. ORAM, LTD. 520 SOUTH 4 TH STREET SECOND FLOOR LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101 TEL. 702.384-5563 FAX. 702.974-0623	13	
R. Ora eet S evada Fax. 7	14	
DPHER 4 TH STF EGAS, N 1-5563	15	
CHRIST DUTH LAS V 702.384	16	
520 SC TEL.	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	
	27	
	28	

CHRISTOPHER R. ORAM, LTD. 520 SOUTH 4TH STREET | SECOND FLOOR LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89101 TEL. 702.384-5563 | FAX. 702.974-0623

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify and affirm that this document was filed electronically with the Nevada Supreme Court 10th day of December, 2021. Electronic Service of the foregoing document shall be made in accordance with the Master Service List as follows:

AARON FORD Nevada Attorney General

STEVE WOLFSON Chief Deputy District Attorney

CHRISTOPHER R. ORAM, ESQ.

BY:

/s/ Nancy Medina An Employee of Christopher R. Oram, Esq.

Electronically Filed 4/14/2021 12:35 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN 1 2 DISTRICT COURT 3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 6 Plaintiff(s), Case No. C-17-324805-1 7 VS. Department XXI 8 TOYER EDWARDS, 9 Defendant(s). 10 11 BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK B. BAILUS, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 12 13 THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 2018 14 15 16 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: **JURY TRIAL - DAY 4 of 5** 17 18 19 APPEARANCES: For the Plaintiff(s): EKATERINA DERJAVINA, ESQ. 20 MICHAEL DICKERSON, ESQ. **Deputy District Attorneys** 21 22 For the Defendant(s): ELAINE ODEH, ESQ.

RECORDED BY: ROBIN PAGE, COURT RECORDER

23

24

25

1

SHANA S. BROUWERS, ESQ.

Deputy Public Defenders

INDEX Page # WITNESSES FOR THE STATE: **CHASE LOVATO Cross-Examination Redirect Examination Recross-Examination Further Redirect Examination JOSHUA SIMMS Direct Examination Cross-Examination Juror Questions** EXHIBITS Defendant's Exhibits: Nos. A through F

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

stipulated to.

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 2018

[Proceeding commenced at 1:43 p.m.]

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: This is continuation of the case of State of Nevada versus Toyer Edwards, Case Number C324805. Let the record reflect presence of counsel for the State, counsel for the

defendant, and the defendant. Are we ready to proceed forward, counsel?

Defense has proposed Exhibits A through F. And it's my

MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor, but --

MS. BROUWERS: Just a very brief housekeeping matter.

understanding that the State's not objecting to A through F. We

also have a proposed G that they're not willing to stipulate to, but

for purposes of just keeping the evidence moving, if we could just

make it noted for the record that Defense Exhibits A through F are

THE COURT: Is that correct, State?

MS. DERJAVINA: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Exhibits A -- Defense Proposed Exhibits A through F will be admitted.

MS. BROUWERS: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Pursuant to stipulation.

[Defendant's Exhibit Numbers A through F admitted.]

24 25

MS. DERJAVINA: Thank you.

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25

1

MS.	ODEH:	Thank v	MOU.
IVIO.	ODLII.	I Hallin V	vou.

Judge, one other matter that we just want to make a record. Mr. Edwards is still wearing the same ripped pants with the broken fly. Our -- my investigator did take clothes over to the jail two days ago. And for some unknown reason, he's not getting dressed in them. I don't know if the Court can --

THE COURT: Do we have a representative from the Clark County Detention Center?

CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Two days ago whoever was in court, apparently the Defense investigator has brought over a different pair of pants for Mr. Edwards. I asked that person to look in -- to see if she could locate them and provide them to Mr. Edwards. I'm going to make the same request of you.

Do you know where he dropped them off, counsel?

MS. ODEH: I have a receipt. I can --

THE COURT: On the break can you show them the receipt --

MS. ODEH: Yes.

THE COURT: -- and maybe they can assist you in locating the clothing.

MS. ODEH: Yes.

CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Your Honor, I asked

Mr. Edwards if he mentioned it to the officer that dressed him out,
that he has the same pants. He said he didn't bother.

1	THE DEFENDANT: I talked to him. It's been three days.
2	CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Because we have different
3	officers changing them.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Will you be sure
5	MS. ODEH: I can give it to them now.
6	CORRECTIONS OFFICER: Yes, that's good.
7	MS. ODEH: Do you want it now?
8	THE COURT: And, apparently, be sure that you advise
9	your client to tell the officer who provides him with the clothing that
10	there is another pair of pants that he would prefer to wear.
11	MS. ODEH: Okay.
12	MR. DICKERSON: And, Your Honor, if I could by no
13	means am I belittling the issue here. I just would ask for the record
14	that Your Honor make a record of what you see of his pants and
15	that it's not readily apparent when he's standing here right now that
16	the side seam is open or unsewn or that the fly is broken.
17	THE COURT: Okay. From the Court's perspective, at this
18	point, Mr. Edwards has been predominantly seated, even when he's
19	standing, from my perspective, you cannot readily see a tear in his
20	pants or that his fly is inoperable.
21	Is that satisfactory, State?
22	MR. DICKERSON: That's all the State asks for. Thank you,
23	Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
25	Can I bring the jury in?

1	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.
2	[Jury reconvened at 1:48 p.m.]
3	THE COURT: Let the record reflect the presence of
4	counsel for the State, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant.
5	Will the parties stipulate to the presence of the jury?
6	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.
7	MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Counsel for the defendant, why don't you
9	bring the witness in.
10	Are you prepared to go forward with cross-examination?
11	MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Sir, I would remind you you are still under
13	oath.
14	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
15	THE COURT: You may proceed.
16	MS. BROUWERS: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	CHASE LOVATO,
18	[having been previously called as a witness and first duly
19	reaffirmed, testified as follows:]
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION
21	BY MS. BROUWERS:
22	Q Good afternoon, sir. Welcome back. All right. Okay. I'm
23	going to be referencing some of the stuff you testified to yesterday,
24	then I've got some new questions for you as well. Okay?
25	All right. So you mentioned that you're not currently

1	employ	ed by Global Security Concepts; is that correct?
2	Α	No.
3	Q	Okay. And you're employed by Caesars?
4	А	Yes, I am.
5	Q	Okay. When did you stop working for Global Securities
6	Concep	1?
7	Α	Around a year into the position.
8	Q	Okay. So
9	Α	More accurately, October 9th.
10	Q	Okay. October 9th of last year?
11	Α	Of 2017.
12	Q	2017. Okay.
13		What was the circumstance that caused you to leave that
14	position	?
15	А	Better employment.
16	Q	Fair enough. Better money?
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	All right. So when was your roughly, when was your
19	start da	te with Global Security position or Concepts?
20	А	I cannot recall at the moment.
21	Q	Okay. Do you remember what month and what year? Or
22	at least	what season, what year?
23	А	Around February of 2017.
24	Q	Okay. Let me put it like this: By the time that the incident
25	that you	're here to testify about today happened, how long had you

1	been employed by Global Security Concepts?		
2	А	About six months.	
3	Q	Six months? Okay. Had you been have you had you	
4	been sta	ationed at the Hawaiian Marketplace that whole time?	
5	А	Yes.	
6	Q	Okay. And did you ever work anywhere else for Global	
7	Concept	ts?	
8	Α	After the stabbing, yes.	
9	Q	Okay. So after this incident, where did you work?	
0	А	On Sahara and Decatur.	
1	Q	Okay. Was that another business?	
2	А	It was still Global Security Concepts, but it was just a	
3	different site.		
4	Q	Okay. And so going back to when you were first hired by	
5	Global Securities Concepts, I want to talk a little bit about the		
6	about ki	nd of the training you got. Did you receive training?	
7	Α	No.	
8	Q	You received no training?	
9	Α	Not for handcuffing or mace.	
20	Q	Okay. You received no training for handcuffing or mace?	
21	Α	No.	
22	Q	Okay. Did you receive any training at all?	
23	Α	On-site training, yes.	
24	Q	Okay. So there was never a time when you had to go sit	
25	with an	instructor and the instructor said, This is what we do when	

1	this hap	ppens, this is what we do when that happens?	
2	Α	No.	
3	Q	Okay. Basically, it was you pass your drug test, they give	
4	you a b	adge and send you on your merry way?	
5	А	The manager would shadow you for about a month.	
6	Q	Okay.	
7	Α	It's our supervisor.	
8	Q	Okay. I'm going to	
9		MS. BROUWERS: If I could approach your clerk?	
10		THE COURT: Yes.	
11	BY MS. BROUWERS:		
12	Q	I'm going to show you what's been marked as Defense	
13	Proposed Exhibit G. I		
14		THE COURT: And for the record	
15		MS. BROUWERS: Sorry.	
16		THE COURT: Defendant's Proposed Exhibits A through	
17	F have I	been admitted pursuant to stipulation.	
18		MS. BROUWERS: Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate	
19	that.		
20	BY MS.	BROUWERS:	
21	Q	So this is what's been marked as Defense Proposed	
22	Exhibit	G. Can you just take a look at that for a second?	
23	А	[Witness complies.]	
24	Q	You don't need to read the whole thing, but if you do want	
25	to, you	certainly can. Thank you.	
1			

1		Do you recognize this document?
2	Α	No, I do not.
3	Q	Okay. But it does say it comes from Global
4		MR. DICKERSON: Objection.
5		MS. DERJAVINA: Yes.
6	BY MS.	BROUWERS:
7	Q	You don't recognize that document?
8	Α	I do not recall it.
9	Q	Okay. And you never received a training manual of any
10	kind?	
11	Α	I do not recall.
12	Q	Okay. So you don't know whether or not you may have
13	received	d some kind of training manual?
14	А	At this point, I don't recall.
15	Q	Okay. Did you receive any kind of training manual when
16	you wer	nt to Caesars and was employed by them?
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	Okay. All right. But fair to say, prior to this incident, you
19	did not	receive any training concerning how to handcuff someone
20	properly	/?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	And you did not receive any training on how and how
23	I'm sorr	y did not receive any training on how or when mace
24	should l	pe used?
25	Α	Affirmative.

1	Q	Okay. Thank you.
2		And, actually, I wanted to talk to you about the mace
3	really q	uickly. You I'm going to use your phrase, you called it
4	your pe	rsonal mace; do you remember calling it that?
5	Α	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. And can you clarify for me again why you called it
7	your pe	rsonal mace?
8	А	It was the mace I kept on my at all times in case I ever
9	needed	to use it. It was even if I was off the clock on the way
10	home, t	hat was my mace I could use in self-defense.
11	Q	Okay. At any point prior to this, understanding that you
12	never re	eceived job training concerning the use of mace, have you
13	ever red	eived any other kind of training concerning the use of
14	mace?	
15	Α	No.
16	Q	Okay. Have you ever previously deployed your mace?
17	Α	No.
18	Q	Okay. This was the first time you've ever deployed mace?
19	Α	Yes.
20	Q	Okay. And you actually had a little bit of trouble with
21	getting	it to work the first time, right?
22	Α	Yes.
23	Q	Okay. So going back to this particular shift, you said that
24	you had	been working this is you were working a double?
25	Α	Yes.

1	Q	So you'd just gotten off the graveyard?
2	Α	Affirmative.
3	Q	And you were starting the morning shift?
4	А	Affirmative.
5	Q	Which ordinarily starts at 6:00 a.m.?
6	Α	Yes.
7	Q	And you saw what you testified to was that you saw
8	Mr. Edv	vards sleeping in front of the DJ's Taco stand
9	about 6	:30 a.m.; is that right?
10	А	I first saw him at the beginning of the shift sitting down in
11	the chai	r. I did not know if he was sleeping at the time.
12	Q	Okay. So at the beginning of your shift,
13	meanin	g 6:00 a.m.?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. I
16		MS. BROUWERS: Would you mind if I Court's
17	indulge	nce.
18		Thank you for bearing with me for just a moment.
19		[Pause in proceedings.]
20		[Video played.]
21	BY MS.	BROUWERS:
22	Q	Okay. You were shown this video on direct examination
23	too; is t	hat correct?
24		MS. DERJAVINA: Objection. Your Honor, I don't believe
25	this wit	ness was shown this specific video.

1		MS. BROUWERS: I apologize. I'll withdraw that one. I'm
2	sorry.	
3	BY MS.	BROUWERS:
4	Q	But do you recognize this general area?
5	А	Yes, I do.
6	Q	Okay. And what is that?
7	А	That would be the common walkway for Hawaiian
8	Marketp	lace.
9	Q	Okay.
10	А	Next to DJ Tacos and Evening Call.
11	Q	Okay. And do you recognize anyone in that video or in
12	this vide	eo still?
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	Who do you recognize?
15	А	The Black male adult standing or walking towards what
16	looks lik	e DJ Tacos and Evening Call.
17	Q	Okay. And you recognize that person to be?
18	Α	Mr. Toyer.
19	Q	Okay. And it looks like he's walking from the right side of
20	the scre	en to the left side of the screen; is that fair to say?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. Do you just if you know, do you know what
23	direction	n that is, north, south, east, west?
24	Α	That would be heading east.
25	Q	Heading east, okay. And so we can see, in the upper

1	right-ha	nd corner, that's we can kind of it's kind of faded, but
2	we can	see the Strip; is that right?
3	А	Yes. That direction is southbound on the Strip.
4	Q	Correct. This is a southbound view of the Strip and so up
5	in that u	pper right-hand corner are Strip properties, correct?
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	Okay. And so fair to say he appears to be walking from
8	the stree	et side towards inside towards where the marketplace is,
9	correct?	
10	Α	Yes.
11	Q	Okay. Can you tell me, for the reference of the timestamp
12	and the	date, can you tell me what those are?
13	Α	6/18/2017, Sunday morning at 6:39.
14	Q	Okay. 6:39, fair to say in the morning?
15	Α	Yes. From the video, yes.
16	Q	Okay. And I'm going to go ahead and let that play.
17		[Video played.]
18	Q	And what is it you see Mr. Edwards doing?
19	Α	Walking towards DJ's Taco.
20	Q	And DJ's Taco is the place where you saw him sitting?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	Okay.
23		[Video played.]
24	Q	Had you seen him anywhere else on the property before
25	that?	

1	Α	No.
2	Q	Okay. So when you said the beginning of your shift
3	was 6:00	a.m. is when you saw him, you actually saw him closer
4	to 6:39;	is that fair to say?
5	А	I don't know if all the clocks on the cameras are correct
6	with the	times we're using.
7	Q	Okay. And then how long did you wait before you tried to
8	wake Mı	r. Edwards up?
9	А	Around 30 minutes.
0	Q	Around 30 minutes?
1	А	Yes.
2	Q	Okay. From the time you first noticed him?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	And you hadn't noticed him anywhere else on property?
5	А	No.
6	Q	Okay. You only noticed him sitting in front of that taco
7	stand?	
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. Why did you wait 30 minutes?
20	А	So I can conduct the first the beginning shift's patrol
21	and give	e him the time to leave on his own.
22	Q	Okay. Did you have any understanding about whether
23	someon	e was allowed to be there for 30 minutes without being
24	asked to	leave?
25	Α	Yes.

1	Q	Okay. What was your understanding?
2	Α	That you can stay on property, it's fine, but you cannot be
3	sleepin	g on property.
4	Q	Okay. With respect to the to a 30 any kind
5	of 30-m	inute window, though, did you have any
6	А	That was just more for me to do my patrol. But it took 30
7	minutes	5.
8	Q	Okay. So you didn't have any kind of understanding if it
9	was oka	ay to be there for 30 minutes or not?
0	А	No.
1	Q	Okay. Do you recall testifying at a preliminary hearing for
2	this cas	e?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	When you testified at that preliminary
5		MS. DERJAVINA: And, objection, Your Honor. If we may
6	approac	ch?
7		[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
8		THE COURT: Okay.
9		MS. DERJAVINA: So part of the transcript that he was
20	talking	about with [indiscernible] under the law [indiscernible]
21	trespas	s [indiscernible]. So our objection is that the legal
22	conclus	ion that he's testifying to.
23		THE COURT: Okay. I'm not understanding. She hasn't
24	asked a	question yet.
25		MS_DERJAVINA: Just like I know the part that she's

going to be asking about.

MS. BROUWERS: What I'm asking is what his understanding was. I actually have no idea if that's a law.

MS. DERJAVINA: Up until --

THE COURT: Okay. But I think -- again, without hearing a question, if her question is going to be what is your understanding that a person can remain on property, is that objectionable to you?

MR. DICKERSON: If the question is didn't you testify at the preliminary hearing under the law a person could be on property?

MS. BROUWERS: I'm not asking him to tell me what the law is. I'm asking if his understanding was that you were allowed --

THE COURT: All right. Well, here's my problem, counsel. I've reviewed your jury instructions. We haven't settled instructions yet. But you have several instructions dealing with what trespassing is and what it is not.

MR. DICKERSON: This is actually in regards to loitering.

And we haven't asked him to define loitering and so --

THE COURT: Okay. But my question is, again, I don't know what the question is. You're asking me to make a supposition here. And my concern is dealing with her questioning of him of what his understanding of trespassing is and not allowing it. And then your request that I give instructions regarding trespassing. In other words, I will have limited her cross-examination pursuant to your objection, then if I -- and I'm not saying I will or will not give

1	those instructions then I am giving instructions on what
2	trespassing is after limiting her cross-examination on that exact
3	issue.
4	MS. DERJAVINA: But the final generalized understanding
5	is it's just the way she was asking that there be they probably
6	should be asking him was what are we [indiscernible] the law is.
7	That's our concern, based on
8	MS. BROUWERS: All I'm asking is at that time, what was
9	your understanding of how long people were allowed to be on
10	property?
11	MS. DERJAVINA: She's asking
12	MS. BROUWERS: And at the preliminary hearing, he
13	said he just now said, I don't know. And what he testified to at a
14	preliminary hearing was I thought well, basically, in a nutshell,
15	was I thought I needed to give him 30 minutes.
16	THE COURT: All right. Well, again, I'm not going to limit
17	her cross-examination at this point.
18	MS. DERJAVINA: Okay.
19	MS. BROUWERS: Thank you.
20	THE COURT: Thank you.
21	[End of bench conference.]
22	MS. BROUWERS: Okay. And, counsel, for reference, I am
23	looking at page
24	MS. DERJAVINA: I have the page.
25	MS. BROUWERS: You have it? Okay. Thank you.
	18

1		MS. DERJAVINA: Thank you.
2	BY MS. E	BROUWERS:
3	Q	All right. So you testified just a moment ago that the only
4	reason y	ou waited 30 minutes was because that's how long your
5	patrol to	ok, right?
6	А	That, and again, if he was to move and I would give him
7	the leew	ay of time.
8	Q	Okay. And then my follow-up question to that was did
9	you have	e any kind of understanding at that time about whether
0	someone	e was allowed to be on property for 30 minutes before you
1	could as	k him to leave?
2	Α	Yes.
3	Q	Okay. So you did have that understanding?
4	Α	No, you did ask that, yes.
5	Q	Okay. Thank you for clarifying. I want it to be clear.
6		All right. And you testified just a moment ago that you
7	didn't ha	ve any kind of understanding about whether or not you
8	needed t	o wait 30 minutes in order to let someone to go or in
9	order tha	at someone to go?
20	А	Correct.
21	Q	Okay. And you testified at a preliminary hearing in this
22	case?	
23	А	Yes.
24	Q	Okay. At that preliminary hearing, you took an oath
25	similar to	o the oath that you took actually, identical to the oath that

1	you too	ok in this courtroom?
2	Α	Yes.
3	Q	And you promised to tell the truth?
4	Α	Yes.
5	Q	Just like you promised to tell the truth in this courtroom?
6	Α	Yes.
7	Q	Okay. I'm going to show you your statement from the
8	prelimi	nary hearing. I'm going to ask you to look at lines 6 through
9	let's sa	y 8.
10		So in answer to the question about how much time, what
11	was your response, or your understanding of how much time you	
12	had to give them?	
13	Α	I thought he would leave 30 minutes, which is, by law, he
14	is not lo	oitering until 30 minutes on property.
15		MS. DERJAVINA: And, objection, Your Honor. That's
16	improper legal conclusion.	
17		MS. BROUWERS: Your Honor, I'm not asking him to
18	make a legal conclusion	
19		THE COURT: All right.
20		MS. BROUWERS: I'm just asking for his understanding
21	at that time.	
22		THE COURT: Ask him that question.
23		MS. BROUWERS: Okay.
24	BY MS. BROUWERS:	
25	Q	Was it your understanding at the time that you had to give

20

1	someon	e 30 minutes before you could ask them to leave?
2	Α	Yes.
3	Q	Okay.
4		MS. DERJAVINA: And, Your Honor, Motion to Strike that.
5	I think y	ou our objection was previously sustained.
6		MS. BROUWERS: And, Your Honor, I believe you said I
7	could as	sk that question. Just simply as to his understanding.
8		THE COURT: I'll allow the question I'll allow the answer
9	to the q	uestion that what was your understanding. He was
10	allowed	I'll allow that answer to stand.
11		Was there a previous that was the question you had an
12	objectio	n to; is that correct, counsel?
13		MS. DERJAVINA: Correct, Your Honor.
14		THE COURT: I'll allow it as to his understanding.
15		MS. BROUWERS: That's all I'm asking.
16		THE COURT: And I would counsel approach.
17		[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
18		MS. BROUWERS: I'm moving off of it, I'm not asking
19	anymor	e.
20		THE COURT: No, that's fine. I don't need to do a
21	cautiona	ary instruction, that that's not what the law is. Because, I
22	mean, ii	n other words, it's just his understanding, counsel.
23		MS. BROUWERS: Uh-huh.
24		MR. DICKERSON: Right. The part that we objected to was
25	just the	m saying under the law.

1	THE COURT: I understand. But that's just his
2	understanding of what the law is. People have understandings all
3	the time. So, again, I don't need to do any type of instruction,
4	limiting instruction; is that correct?
5	MR. DICKERSON: Well, we would ask that they instruct
6	that you were going to instruct them on the law and that this
7	witness isn't to make any conclusions about the law.
8	MS. BROUWERS: That's fine with me.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Can I
10	MS. BROUWERS: I don't mind that at all. Yeah.
11	THE COURT: All right.
12	MR. DICKERSON: [Indiscernible.]
13	THE COURT: I'll do that as a limiting instruction.
14	MR. DICKERSON: Great. Thank you.
15	THE COURT: Thank you.
16	[End of bench conference.]
17	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, at the end of this
18	case, I will instruct you as to what the law is. Is that understood?
19	Thank you.
20	MS. BROUWERS: Thank you very much.
21	BY MS. BROUWERS:
22	Q Okay. So in your recollection, though, you gave him 30
23	minutes before you asked him to go?
24	A Yes.
25	Q Okay. This is, again, from State's Exhibit 3, which has

1	been admitted by stipulation, if I can get it to work.	
2		[Video played.]
3	Q	Okay. Can you give me the date and the timestamp for
4	this vide	eo, sir?
5	А	6/18/2017, Sunday at 6:55 in the morning.
6	Q	Okay. And do you recognize anyone in this video?
7	Α	Yes. I recognize people in this video.
8	Q	Okay. Who do you recognize?
9	Α	Myself in the neon green shirt.
10	Q	Uh-huh.
11	Α	My supervisor, William Allison, in the white shirt, and
12	Mr. Toyer laying down in the bottom right-hand corner on the chair	
13	Q	Okay. And this is the same area in front of DJ's that we
14	were talking about before, just a different angle, right?	
15	А	Yes.
16	Q	Okay. And so this is 6:55?
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	And you saw him sit down in the other video at 6:39,
19	roughly?	
20	А	Based off the timestamp for the video, yes.
21	Q	Okay. So you didn't give him 30 minutes.
22	А	No. I have I did.
23	Q	Prior to the incident that we're here to discuss today, had
24	you ever seen Mr. Edwards at the Hawaiian Marketplace on any	
25	dates p	rior?
1	1	

1	Α	No.	
2	Q	Okay. So it was your intention to ask Mr. Edwards to	
3	leave th	e property because, to your understanding, he was	
4	sleeping	y, correct?	
5	А	Yes.	
6	Q	Okay. You don't want people sleeping on the property?	
7	Α	Yes.	
8	Q	Generally, what kind of people do you see sleeping on the	
9	property?		
10		MS. DERJAVINA: Objection. Relevance.	
11		MS. BROUWERS: Your Honor, this has to do with his	
12	motivation to make ask him to leave.		
13		THE COURT: All right. Overruled.	
14	BY MS. BROUWERS:		
15	Q	Generally, what kind of people do you see do you	
16	encounter sleeping on property?		
17	Α	There's no general of, like, sleepers. They come in all	
18	shapes and forms.		
19	Q	Okay. Do you see a lot of homeless people at the	
20	Hawaiian Marketplace?		
21	Α	Yes.	
22	Q	Do you see them sleeping on property?	
23	Α	Yes.	
24	Q	Okay. And you generally ask those people to leave?	
25	Α	Yes.	
1	1		

1	Q	They're undesirables to have at the business.	
2	Α	Yes.	
3	Q	So when you first approached him, he wasn't responsive	
4	when yo	ou were asking when you were asking him to wake up,	
5	correct?		
6	А	Negative. No. No.	
7	Q	No, he was not responsive?	
8	А	No, he was not responsive.	
9	Q	Okay. And I believe you testified that you whistled; did	
10	you whistle at him?		
11	Α	Yes.	
12	Q	Okay. How loud did you whistle?	
13	Α	I whistled from far away and it was very loud.	
14	Q	Okay. You're a good whistler, I'm not. So when you say	
15	from far away, how far away were you?		
16	Α	About from the entrance of our Hawaiian Marketplace	
17	indoor structure, so about, like, 30 meters away.		
18	Q	30 meters away	
19	Α	I was yelling at him and trying to make contact.	
20	Q	Okay. So from 30 meters away, you whistled and he was	
21	not responsive to that whistle from 30 meters away?		
22	Α	No.	
23	Q	Okay.	
24	А	I kept doing that until I approached him very closely.	
25	Q	Okay. He still doesn't wake up?	

1	Α	No.	
2	Q	Pretty deep sleep?	
3	Α	Yes.	
4	Q	Okay. And then when he first woke up, it was your	
5	testimo	ny that he initially indicated he didn't want to leave?	
6	Α	First thing he said was, Go get security over here.	
7	Q	Okay. So he didn't recognize immediately that you were	
8	security?		
9	Α	I don't think so.	
10	Q	Okay. You don't think he knew?	
11	Α	No, no. I do think he knew. But I don't think that was I	
12	thought he knew that we were security, because it is very hard to		
13	not see our shirts and recognize us immediately.		
14	Q	Okay. But what he what you testified he said to you	
15	was, Go	get security?	
16	А	Yes.	
17	Q	Okay. So I'm going to show you another video. I'm going	
18	to pause it and ask you a couple of questions.		
19		And while I'm doing that, sir, how tall are you?	
20	А	Around 6-flat.	
21	Q	Six	
22	А	6 feet.	
23	Q	foot?	
24	Α	6 feet.	
25	Q	Okay. And is Mr. Allison, is he similarly similar height	
		26	

1	to you?	
2	А	Might be an inch taller.
3	Q	Okay. And then at this time, so around June 18th of 2017,
4	how mu	ch did you weigh?
5	А	Around 210.
6	Q	Okay. Do you work out?
7	А	Here and there.
8	Q	Okay. How old are you, sir?
9	Α	At this point or now?
10	Q	Back then. Thank you for clarifying.
11	Α	Approximately 21 years old.
12		[Video played.]
13	Q	Okay. And just once again, do you recognize this area?
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. And what's what area is this?
16	Α	That is behind Evening Call, facing DJ's Tacos.
17	Q	Okay. So it's that same table that we've been talking
18	about in front of DJ's Tacos?	
19	Α	Yes.
20	Q	Okay. And Mr. Edwards is there?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. So I'm going to ask you to watch this video for a
23	moment	, and I'm going to stop you when I've got a question.
24		[Video played.]
25	Q	Okay. That's yourself and Mr. Allison?
		27

1	Α	Yes.	
2	Q	Okay. You both have coffee in your hands?	
3	Α	Yes.	
4	Q	Okay.	
5		[Video played.]	
6	Q	Okay. So at this point, he's only kind of stirred a little bit;	
7	fair to say? Mr		
8	А	Can you repeat the question, please?	
9	Q	Thank you. I'll use the correct name.	
10		So at this point in the video, Mr. Edwards has only kind of	
11	started to stir just a little bit?		
12	А	He has responded to us a couple of times.	
13	Q	Okay. So he's responsive at this point?	
14	А	Yes.	
15	Q	You're putting your coffee down?	
16	А	Yes.	
17		[Video played.]	
18	Q	And you're still talking to him?	
19	А	Yes.	
20	Q	Okay. And he's still not really moving, right?	
21	Α	[No audible response.]	
22	Q	Sir, you have to answer out loud. And he's still not really	
23	moving	, correct?	
24	Α	No.	
25	Q	I'm not correct?	
		20	

1	Α	No, he's not moving that much at all.	
2	Q	Thank you.	
3		[Video played.]	
4	Q	Now Mr. Allison's put down his coffee?	
5	Α	Yes.	
6	Q	Okay. And what do you well, let me see if I can back up	
7	so we can review that. I'm going to back up a little bit to catch a		
8	momen	t.	
9		Now, what is it that you're doing with your hands?	
10	А	I pulled out a pair of handcuffs.	
11	Q	Pulled out a pair of handcuffs? Okay. Those handcuffs	
12	that you've not received any training on how to use?		
13	Α	Affirmative.	
14		[Video played.]	
15	Q	Okay. Now you're pulling something else out, right?	
16	Α	[No audible response.]	
17	Q	Did you also pull out something else?	
18	Α	I missed that.	
19	Q	Okay. I can back it up, that's not a problem.	
20		Handcuffs. We may be able to catch it from another	
21	angle. I	But you did ultimately pull out your mace as well, correct?	
22	Α	Yes.	
23	Q	That mace that you never received any training on how to	
24	use?		
25	Α	Yes.	
ı	1		

1	Q	That mace that you've never deployed before this
2	incident	?
3	А	Yes.
4		[Video played.]
5	Q	Okay. And at that point, Mr. Edwards gets up and he
6	starts to	kind of walk off to the side, right?
7	Α	Yes.
8	Q	Okay. I he actually indicated to you that he was going to
9	get up and leave.	
10		MS. DERJAVINA: Objection. Hearsay.
11	BY MS. BROUWERS:	
12	Q	Did you have any
13		THE COURT: Wait a minute.
14		MS. BROUWERS: I'm sorry.
15		THE COURT: What was your question?
16		MS. BROUWERS: My question had been he indicated
17	he that Mr. Edwards had indicated he was going to leave. I can	
18	rephras	e.
19		THE COURT: Okay. Counsel approach.
20		MS. BROUWERS: Yes, absolutely.
21		THE WITNESS: Can I get some water, please?
22		THE COURT: Sure.
23		THE WITNESS: Thank you.
24		[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
25		THE COURT: I don't understand your objection.

1	M	S. DERJAVINA: She's asking what did the defendant tell
2	you, that the	e defendant stated, it's hearsay.
3	TH	HE COURT: It's Defendant's statement, a party
4	admission.	Why is it hearsay?
5	M	R. DICKERSON: Party opponent.
6	M	S. DERJAVINA: No, it's a party we can elicit it, but
7	they can't e	licit the defendant's statements.
8	M	R. DICKERSON: He'd have to testify.
9	M	S. BROUWERS: I can ask it a different way.
10	M	S. DERJAVINA: If I disagree with you
11	TH	HE COURT: I'm still not understanding your objection.
12	But just restate the	
13	M	S. BROUWERS: That's fine. No problem.
14	TH	IE COURT: Rephrase the question.
15	M	S. BROUWERS: Okay. Not a problem.
16		[End of bench conference.]
17	BY MS. BRO	DUWERS:
18	Q Sc	as we looked at the video just a couple moments ago,
19	he had started to stand up and kind of move off to the side, right?	
20	A Ye	es.
21	Q OF	cay. Did you have any understanding of whether he was
22	going to be	complying with your request for him to go?
23	A No	o, he was not.
24	Q 0k	cay. Again, you did you do recall having testified at a
25	preliminary	hearing in this stage or in this case? Yes?

1	Α	Yes. Yes. And can I ask when that was?
2	Q	You can ask when that was. And I can tell you when that
3	was. T	hat was on July 5th, 2017. Does that refresh your
4	recolle	ction about when this happened? About when the
5	prelimi	nary hearing happened?
6	Α	Not really.
7	Q	But you do recall having testified?
8	Α	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. And if I if the parties can all agree that that
10	testimo	ony happened on February 5th I'm sorry, not
11	Februa	ry 5th July 5th, fair to say that was closer in time to this
12	incident than now is?	
13	А	Yes.
14	Q	And as we kind of went through before, when you
15	testifie	d at that preliminary hearing, you were under oath?
16	А	Yes.
17	Q	You promised to tell the truth?
18	А	Yes.
19	Q	And that, again, was closer in time than today's date is,
20	closer i	n time to the incident?
21	А	Yes.
22	Q	Okay.
23		MS. BROUWERS: Court's very brief indulgence.
24		[Pause in proceedings.]
25	Q	So when he is standing when he's standing up and

1	receive	any training for your position prior to starting it, did you at
2	any poi	nt subsequent to this incident receive any training
3	concern	ing deescalation policies?
4		MS. DERJAVINA: And objection, Your Honor. Relevance
5	to after	the incident.
6		THE COURT: Overruled.
7		THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question?
8	BY MS.	BROUWERS:
9	Q	Understanding that you didn't receive any training prior to
10	starting	your position at Global Securities Concepts, did you
11	subsequ	uent or after this incident receive training concerning
12	deescal	ation policies?
13	Α	No.
14	Q	No training?
15	Α	No training.
16	Q	Didn't have to go to any meetings?
17	Α	Not on deescalation.
18	Q	Okay. Did you have to have any meetings concerning this
19	incident	at your work?
20	Α	It was not brought up.
21	Q	Did you have
22	Α	Not with me personally.
23	Q	Okay. So you never ever met with anyone from your
24	compan	y to talk about this incident?
25	Α	Yes. But it was not in the nature of deescalation.

1	Q	Okay. What was it in the nature of?
2	А	Mace training, handcuff training.
3	Q	Oh, so after this, you received mace training and handcuff
4	training	?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	Okay. And nothing was ever discussed with you about
7	deescala	ating a situation?
8	А	No.
9	Q	Nothing was ever discussed with you about calling the
10	police w	hen you believe that there's a threat?
11	А	Yes.
12	Q	Yes, something was said to you about that?
13	Α	Yes, about calling the police. Yes.
14	Q	Okay. So you were told that and I want to clarify before
15	and afte	er
16		MS. DERJAVINA: Objection, Your Honor.
17		MS. BROUWERS: Sorry.
18		MS. DERJAVINA: Hearsay.
19		THE COURT: I'm sorry?
20		MS. DERJAVINA: It's a hearsay. What she's trying to
21	elicit is l	hearsay.
22		THE COURT: Ask your question.
23		MS. BROUWERS: Well, I think I need to clarify time first
24	before I	can do that. Okay.
25		THE COURT: I think you made your objection before the

1	entire q	uestion came out. So I'm not ruling on your objection until I
2	hear th	e entire question.
3		MS. BROUWERS: Okay.
4	BY MS.	BROUWERS:
5	Q	So with respect to meetings that you had concerning this
6	inciden	t, after the incident happened, you learned that you were
7	suppos	ed to call the police if you believe there was a threatening
8	situatio	n?
9	Α	There was no meetings between any form of
10	manage	ement and me about this incident. What occurred was when
11	my bos	s got on property, he told me we are going to just call Metro
12	from no	ow on for your safety.
13	Q	Okay. Because you, of course, yourself are not law
14	enforce	ment?
15	А	I am not.
16	Q	Okay. And your job has titles like lieutenant and
17	Α	Sergeant.
18	Q	stuff like that sergeant?
19	Α	Yes.
20	Q	Okay. Those aren't terms that mean something like the
21	military	, that's more of a rank in your own kind of company, right?
22	Α	It's a chain of command that we go through.
23	Q	A chain of command that you go through. Okay.
24		So I'm going to show you a different angle.
25		[Video played.]

1	Q	Okay. And this is kind of a just a different angle of what
2	we just	looked at. I just I you just put your coffee cup down?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. And we had discussed that from the other video as
5	well.	
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	And for the record, can you tell me the date and time on
8	this?	
9	А	6/18/2017, Sunday at 6:56 in the morning.
10	Q	Okay. Thank you for that.
11		[Video played.]
12	Q	Okay. And for the record, if you could tell me the date and
13	time on	this one?
14	А	6/18/2017, Sunday at 6:56 in the morning.
15	Q	Okay. So just mere seconds after the one that we just
16	watched	d, just a an just a separate clip, right?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	Okay.
19		[Video played.]
20	Q	Mr. Allison puts down his coffee as well, correct?
21	А	Yes.
22	Q	And you've now pulled out your handcuffs?
23	А	Yes.
24	Q	Those handcuffs that you have not received training on
25	how to	use?

1	Α	Yes.
2	Q	This is showing you that mace or, I'm sorry, this is
3	showing	you pulling out the mace?
4	А	Yes.
5	Q	That mace that, once again, you have not been trained to
6	use prio	r to this incident?
7	Α	Yes.
8	Q	That you've never deployed prior to this incident?
9	Α	I have not.
10		[Video played.]
11	Q	Kind of jangling those handcuffs around?
12	Α	No, I'm fidgeting. I'm a fidgeter.
13	Q	You're a fidgeter?
14	Α	Yep.
15	Q	Okay. Are they making any kind of sounds?
16	Α	I'm telling him to remove his hand out of his pocket or
17	he'll be i	maced.
18	Q	Okay. I think possibly you didn't understand my question.
19	Were the	e handcuffs making any kind of sounds?
20	Α	No.
21	Q	Okay. Those metal handcuffs don't make sounds?
22	Α	I wasn't clicking them together.
23	Q	Okay.
24		[Video played.]
25	Q	Now, on direct examination, you testified that when you
		38

1	taught	Mr. Allison that you had kind of whispered to him that, you
2	know, y	ou thought he you thought that Mr. Edwards was armed,
3	right?	
4	Α	What I said was, He has a knife.
5	Q	Okay. And you testified that you kind of said it quietly?
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	Okay. How quietly?
8	А	Around a whisper.
9	Q	Around a whisper?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	And then you also testified during direct examination that
12	kind of	throughout all this, you were saying, Take your hands out of
13	your	you know, take your hands out of your pocket, right?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. How loudly were you saying that? In what kind
16	of	
17	Α	Very sternly. It was not too loud, because there were still
18	witness	ses in the area.
19	Q	Can you go ahead and say it to me the way in the same
20	tone of voice, in the same volume that you said it to him?	
21	А	Sir, you need to remove your hands out of your pocket or
22	you wil	I be maced.
23	Q	Okay. And you repeated that a few times?
24	А	Yes.
25	0	At that volume?

1	Α	Yes.
2	Q	Okay. Fair to say during all of this, Mr. Edwards was kind
3	of loud?	
4	А	Yes.
5	Q	Okay. Also fair to say that during all of this, most of his
6	attention	was directed to Mr. Allison?
7	А	Yes.
8	Q	Okay. He wasn't directing too much of his conversation to
9	you?	
10	А	No, he was not.
11	Q	And he was shouting? Mr. Edwards was shouting?
12	А	Wasn't shouting, but he did have a high tone of voice.
13	Q	Okay. He was louder than you, for example?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	Was Mr. Allison how loud was Mr. Allison, to your
16	recollect	ion?
17	Α	He was about matching his tone.
18	Q	Okay. So he was loud too?
19	Α	Yes.
20	Q	Louder than you?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	Okay.
23		[Video played.]
24	Q	Okay. And that's when he stands up and kind of walks
25	kind of a	little bit backwards and to the side, yes?
		40

1	Α	Yes.
2	Q	Okay. And again, you and Mr. Allison track his
3	movem	ents?
4	А	Yes.
5		[Video played.]
6	Q	Okay. Now, during all of this, prior to being maced, he did
7	not pull	out the knife?
8	А	No.
9	Q	Okay. Prior to being maced, he certainly wasn't swinging
10	it aroun	d?
11	Α	No.
12	Q	Okay. Prior to being maced his hands stayed in his
13	pocket?	
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. And you also testified that when you maced him,
16	you trie	d to get under his sunglasses, right?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	Okay. Why is that?
19	Α	Because mace is only effective if it makes contact with the
20	eyes. It	wouldn't be effective if I just hit his sunglasses.
21	Q	Okay. What kind of effect were you going for in terms of
22	how his	eyes would be affected?
23	Α	I was trying to disorient him.
24	Q	Okay. So you were trying to disorient him?
25	Α	Yes.
		4.1

1	Q	Only if you know, do you have any understanding of what
2	mace d	oes to someone physically?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. What's your understanding?
5	Α	It hurts a lot. You cannot breathe as well, you cannot see,
6	and all	you want to do is get it off your face.
7	Q	Okay. Do you know whether it causes your eyes to get
8	red?	
9	А	Very much.
10	Q	Very much red?
11	Α	Yes.
12	Q	They're very irritated?
13	Α	Yes. At my work, another individual has been maced
14	before,	and I've seen the full effects of it
15	Q	Okay.
16	Α	before this incident.
17	Q	Okay. Can you describe that to me? Actually, you know
18	what, h	ow about you can you describe to me how Mr. Edwards
19	looked	after having been maced?
20	А	I do not recall.
21	Q	Okay. I'm going to show you what has been admitted
22		MS. DERJAVINA: Objection, Your Honor. For her just to
23	be a litt	le clear of the timeframe of when things happen and when -
24	who loo	oked when.
25		MS. BROUWERS: No problem.

1	BY MS.	BROUWERS:
2	Q	So I asked you a moment ago to describe how
3	Mr. Edv	vards looked after he had been maced. Did you have the
4	opportu	inity to observe him after he had been maced?
5	Α	Not for long.
6	Q	Okay. My question was: Did you have the opportunity to
7	observe	him before after he had been maced?
8	Α	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. Even if it wasn't for very long?
0	Α	Yes.
1	Q	Okay. I'm going to show you what has been admitted as
2	Defense	e Exhibit B; do you recognize that individual?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. And this individual is Mr. Edwards, correct?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	Do his eyes look red to you?
7	А	His left eye does.
8	Q	Okay. And he has some injuries to him, correct? Can you
9	see tho	se? Some reddening, possibly blood?
20	Α	Yeah, those look like dried blood.
21	Q	Looks like dried blood to you? Okay.
22		And when you observed Mr. Edwards after he had been
23	maced,	even though it was briefly, is that roughly kind of what he
24	looked	ike?
25	Α	I cannot recall.

1	Q	Okay.
2	Α	I was more worried about my own stab wound.
3	Q	There wasn't any question. Thank you.
4		Okay. So just to clarify, prior to being maced,
5	Mr. Edw	ards was certainly argumentative, but he had not
6	brandish	ned a weapon?
7	Α	No.
8	Q	Okay. You maced him and then the weapon came out?
9	Α	Yes.
0	Q	Okay.
1		MS. BROUWERS: Court's indulgence.
2	Q	So after Mr. Edwards was maced, that's when the knife
3	came out, and you had tried to disorient him with that mace,	
4	correct?	
5	Α	Yes.
6	Q	That was your intended goal?
7	Α	Yes.
8	Q	Okay. And then after that, Mr. Allison kind of went to do
9	a like,	a takedown move, right? To take him down?
20	Α	Yes.
21	Q	Okay. And you assisted with that?
22	Α	Yes.
23	Q	Okay. In the course of that assistance, you sustained the
24	injury to	the back of your leg that you testified to previously?
25	Α	Yes.

1	Q	Okay. That injury was treated in the hospital that same
2	day?	
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. You received kind of that adhesive bandage that we
5	looked a	t, right?
6	Α	We did not look at adhesive badges.
7	Q	I'll grab it. I'm showing you what's been admitted as
8	State's E	xhibit 23. And I'm going to zoom way out, because we
9	need to s	see it.
10		Sir, that's your leg, correct?
11	А	Yes.
12	Q	The puncture wound was there?
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	Okay. Did you receive stitches for that or how was it
15	treated?	
16	Α	From what I believe, it was a steri strip.
17	Q	I'm sorry, a what?
18	Α	From what I was to believe, it was a steri strip.
19	Q	Okay. Is that an adhesive that brings the skin together
20	and close	es it?
21	Α	I believe so.
22	Q	Okay. To the best of your recollection, that's how it was
23	treated?	
24	Α	Yes. Yes.
25	Q	Okay. All right. And you are limping, but you were able

1	to walk?	
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	You've never needed a wheelchair in relation to this
4	incident?	
5	А	No.
6	Q	Never needed crutches in relation to this incident?
7	Α	No.
8	Q	Never needed a cane?
9	Α	No.
10	Q	Okay. And then you did not go back for treatment for that
11	leg injury	y, correct?
12	Α	No.
13	Q	Okay. So only it was that one day.
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	How long were you actually in the hospital, in hours?
16	Α	I cannot recall.
17	Q	Okay. Did you stay overnight?
18	Α	No.
19	Q	No. Okay. So would can you estimate for me roughly
20	how mar	ny hours you believe you were there?
21	Α	Four to five hours, probably.
22	Q	Four to five hours. Okay.
23		And Mr. Edwards also sustained some injuries as part of
24	the alter	cation that you were all involved in, correct?
25	Α	I'm not aware.

1	Q	You're not aware?
2	Α	No.
3	Q	Okay. You when you observed him later, you didn't
4	notice?	
5	Α	No.
6	Q	Okay. That wasn't your concern?
7	Α	No.
8	Q	When paramedics came, they gave their attention to you
9	and Mr.	Allison?
10	Α	Yes.
11	Q	They didn't give their attention to the to Mr. Edwards
12	as tha	t you saw?
13	Α	He fought with the paramedics.
14	Q	My question was the paramedics did not give treatment to
15	Mr. Edw	ards that you saw?
16	Α	They offered it.
17	Q	My question was, they didn't treat him that you saw?
18	Α	I'm not aware of that. He was still there when I left.
19	Q	Okay.
20		MS. BROUWERS: Court's indulgence.
21		Your Honor, I will pass the witness.
22		THE COURT: State, any redirect?
23		MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor. If I could just have
24	the Cour	t's indulgence for a minute?
25		THE COURT: Sure.

[Pause in proceedings.]

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

B	Υ	MS	DER.	IΔV	INA:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

- Q Now, a little while ago, Defense counsel asked you a couple of questions regarding what your knowledge was regarding mace?
 - A Yes.
- Q Specifically, how it affects somebody when they get maced?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Remember that?
 - A Yes.
- Q Do you know how long, usually, the effect of mace lasts on a person who's just been maced?
- A It can last up to about three hours, I believe.
- Q So some time?
- A Yes.
 - O Now, in this case, you maced the defendant?
- A Yes.
 - Q And you said based on your knowledge -- or your intent was to disorient him?
- A Yes.
- Q Was that successful in this case?
- MS. BROUWERS: Objection. Calls for speculation.

BY MS. DERJAVINA:

1	Q	Was he still able to move around?
2		THE COURT: Hey, counsel. Objection's sustained.
3		MS. BROUWERS: Thank you.
4		MS. DERJAVINA: I'll rephrase it, Your Honor.
5		THE COURT: Thank you.
6	BY MS. [DERJAVINA:
7	Q	When you maced the defendant, was he still able to move
8	around?	
9	А	Yes.
10	Q	Still able to fight you?
11	А	Yes.
12	Q	Now, the area that you patrol, the Hawaiian Marketplace,
13	is that pr	ivate property?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	Are people allowed to sleep on that property?
16	А	No, they are not.
17	Q	Now, I want to go over some video with you. We actually
18	have it ri	ght here, so perfect.
19		Is, at this point, which is 6:56:53, you're still just talking to
20	him?	
21	А	Yes.
22		[Video played.]
23	Q	I apologize. You'll have to just one more time. The
24	unfortun	ate thing is we can't fast-forward or rewind these videos.
25		[Video played.]

1	Q	Now, I want you I'm going to rewind this. Pay really	
2	close at	ttention to the defendant in this video, if you can.	
3		[Video played.]	
4	Q	Do you see right now it's 6:56:55, do you see something	
5	in the d	lefendant's right hand?	
6	А	I do see something in his right hand.	
7	Q	Okay. What does it look like?	
8	А	That looks like tissues.	
9	Q	Okay.	
10		[Video played.]	
11	Q	So at 6:57:01, at this point are you taking out the	
12	handcuffs?		
13	А	Yes.	
14	Q	Now, it might be hard to see, but if you look close	
15	at 6:57:	04, can you see something in the defendant's left hand? If	
16	you car	n't let me know.	
17	А	I cannot.	
18	Q	But can we see, at 6:55 6:57:05, where is the defendant's	
19	right ha	and now?	
20	А	In his pocket.	
21		[Video played.]	
22	Q	And what did you just do?	
23	А	Pulled out mace.	
24	Q	So before that point, your mace was not out?	
25	А	No.	
		50	

Shawna Ortega • CET-562 • Certified Electronic Transcriber • 602.412.7667

1		[Video played.]
2	Q	And what is happening at this point right now, 6:57:21?
3	You can	just describe to us what was going on, what was the
4	convers	ation?
5	А	We were trespassing Mr. Toyer from property for refusing
6	to leave	
7	Q	You weren't using your mace at this time?
8	А	No, I was not.
9		[Video played.]
10	Q	Now, looking at 6:57:26, does it appear that the defendant
11	is plann	ing on going anywhere?
12		MS. BROUWERS: Objection. Calls for speculation.
13		THE COURT: Sustained.
14	BY MS.	DERJAVINA:
15	Q	Looking at the video, does it look like he got more
16	comfort	able in the chair?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	And at this point he's still refusing to leave?
19	Α	Yes.
20	Q	And, again, you're not using your mace?
21	Α	No.
22		MS. BROUWERS: And again, Your Honor, I'm going to
23	object to	o leading.
24		MS. DERJAVINA: I'll rephrase it, Your Honor.
25	BY MS.	DERJAVINA:

1	Q	Are you using your mace at this time?
2	А	No.
3		[Video played.]
4	Q	And what are you looking at right now in this video?
5	А	His hand in his pocket.
6		[Video played.]
7	Q	And what's going on right now?
8	Α	We are detaining Mr. Toyer.
9	Q	And is he complying with any of your commands?
10	Α	Not until the knife came loose.
11		[Video played.]
12	Q	I won't play it till the end.
13		The State has no further questions.
14		THE COURT: Any recross by the Defense?
15		RECROSS-EXAMINATION
16	BY MS.	BROUWERS:
17	Q	He didn't bring the knife out until after he had been
18	maced,	correct?
19	Α	Yes.
20	Q	Thank you.
21		MS. DERJAVINA: And, Your Honor, I apologize, just have
22	one red	irect on that.
23		FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MS.	DERJAVINA:
25	Q	But you know it is the knife when he put his hands in his
		52

1	pocket?	
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	Thank you.
4		THE COURT: Would you like to ask any additional
5	question	s, Defense?
6		MS. BROUWERS: No.
7		THE COURT: Can this witness be excused?
8		MS. BROUWERS: Your Honor, I don't know if you wanted
9	to questi	on the jury about it.
10		THE COURT: Oh, that's correct.
11		Does anybody have any questions of this witness? Seeing
12	no respo	onse by the jurors, can this witness be excused? Oh, I'm
13	sorry, we	e have one?
14		No, no, no. It has to be in writing. A piece of paper.
15		Okay. So the juror does not have any questions; is that
16	correct?	Okay.
17		Can this witness be excused?
18		MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.
19		THE COURT: Sir, thank you. You can be excused.
20		THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.
21		THE COURT: State, call your next witness.
22		MR. DICKERSON: State's next witness will be Joshua
23	Simms.	
24		Can I approach your clerk, Your Honor?
25		THE COURT: Sure.

1		MR. DICKERSON: Thank you very much.
2		JOSHUA SIMMS,
3	[havin	ng been called as a witness and first duly sworn, testified as
4		follows:]
5		THE COURT CLERK: Please be seated. Would you state
6	and spe	ell your name for the record.
7		THE WITNESS: Yes. It's Joshua Simms, J-O-S-H-U-A,
8	S-I-M-N	1-S.
9		MR. DICKERSON: May I proceed, Your Honor?
10		THE COURT: Yes.
11		MR. DICKERSON: Thank you.
12		DIRECT EXAMINATION
13	BY MR.	DICKERSON:
14	Q	Now are you employed, sir?
15	А	Patrol officer with Las Vegas Metropolitan Police
16	Departr	ment.
17	Q	What's your current assignment?
18	А	I work on the Strip, Convention Area Command patrol.
19	Q	Convention Center Area Command, you said patrol?
20	А	Yes, sir.
21	Q	Convention Center Area Command, is that the area
22	comma	nd or station that generally covers the Strip?
23	А	Yes, sir.
24	Q	And as a patrol officer, what's your duty?
25	А	I respond to calls for service, make legal stops, person
		54

1	stops.	
2	Q	Okay. Working as a patrol officer out of Convention
3	Center A	Area Command, is it common or do you ever respond to
4	calls to	assist security officers?
5	Α	Yes, sir.
6	Q	On a regular basis?
7	Α	Every day.
8	Q	Every day?
9	Α	[No audible response.]
10	Q	Is that a yes?
11	Α	Yes.
12	Q	Lot of security officers out there on the Strip?
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	And so at times do they have people in custody and you
15	come ai	nd respond?
16	А	Yes.
17	Q	Generally, when that happens, then you take over the call?
18	Α	Yes.
19	Q	Is that actually what happened here in this case?
20	Α	Yes. Yes.
21	Q	You responded, security officers had an individual in
22	custody	?
23	А	Yes.
24	Q	And, specifically, you responded to a call on
25	June 18	th, 2017, to the Hawaiian Marketplace; is that right?
1	1	

1	Α	Yes.
2	Q	And the Hawaiian Marketplace is a little outdoor mall area
3	located	on the Strip in Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada?
4	А	Yes.
5	Q	What were the details of the call, generally, that you were
6	respond	ling to?
7	А	Details called two victims were stabbed, and that's pretty
8	much al	I I remember.
9	Q	How was it that you responded to that call?
10	А	I responded Code 3, lights and sirens.
11	Q	Code 3, lights and sirens?
12	Α	Yes.
13	Q	Is that what Code 3 means?
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	Lights and sirens?
16	Α	Yes.
17	Q	You arrived, is that fair to say, approximately 7:02 a.m.?
18	Α	Yes.
19	Q	And where was it that you arrived to on this call?
20	Α	Eventually, I made myself made my way to the security
21	office.	
22	Q	At the Hawaiian Marketplace?
23	Α	Yes.
24	Q	When you arrived at the security office of the Hawaiian
25	Marketp	lace, what was it that you found there?
1	1	

1	Α	There's a suspect in custody sitting down in a chair in
2	cuffs, ar	nd there's two other officers there and security Hawaiian
3	Market	security officers.
4	Q	Two other officers being police officers?
5	Α	Yes.
6	Q	And then Hawaiian Marketplace security officers?
7	А	Correct.
8	Q	And you said there was a suspect that was in custody?
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	Do you see that suspect that was in custody here in court
11	today?	
12	Α	Yes.
13	Q	If you could please point to that individual and identify a
14	piece of	clothing that they're wearing?
15	Α	Gentleman over here's wearing a white dress shirt.
16		MR. DICKERSON: If the record could reflect that Officer
17	Simms	has identified the defendant, Your Honor.
18		THE COURT: The record will so reflect.
19		MR. DICKERSON: Thank you very much.
20	BY MR.	DICKERSON:
21	Q	So when you arrive in there, what's the defendant's
22	demean	or?
23	А	He was very amped up, kind of seemed like he was
24	gloating	about what he had just done.
25		And did you see the security officers?

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Specifically, William Allison and Chase Lovato?
3	Α	Yes.
4	Q	And what was their demeanor?
5	Α	They're being attended to by different officers, but it
6	seemed	like they were attending to some stab wounds that they
7	had just	received.
8	Q	Did you interrogate the defendant or anything?
9	Α	No.
10	Q	But was he talking?
11	Α	Yes, he was talking.
12	Q	A little bit or a lot or what?
13	Α	A lot. He was very amped up and excited, you would say,
14	of what	just happened.
15	Q	And do you wear looks like you do a body cam?
16	А	Yes.
17	Q	What is that?
18	А	That's a camera. I got a battery pack in my pocket. When
19	I get ass	signed to a call, I activate it and it records while I'm on the
20	call.	
21	Q	So you wear that every day?
22	А	Yes.
23	Q	Were you wearing that this day, on June 18th, 2017?
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	You were wearing it when you arrived at the security
	1	58

1	office?	
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	And so that actually records everything that you're
4	saying?	
5	Α	Yes.
6	Q	Have you actually reviewed that footage?
7	Α	Yes.
8		MR. DICKERSON: And if I may publish, Your Honor,
9	what's b	een admitted by stipulation as State's Exhibit 2?
10		THE COURT: And State's Exhibit 2 is what, counsel?
11		MR. DICKERSON: State's Exhibit 2 is a body-worn camera
12	of Office	r Simms.
13		THE COURT: And that has been admitted pursuant to
14	stipulation	on; is that correct?
15		MR. DICKERSON: That's correct.
16		MS. BROUWERS: That's correct, Your Honor.
17		THE COURT: Okay.
18		MR. DICKERSON: And may I approach the officer before
19	publishi	ng?
20		THE COURT: You may.
21		MR. DICKERSON: Thank you.
22	BY MR. I	DICKERSON:
23	Q	Officer Simms, you recognize this particular disc?
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	How is it that you recognize this?
1	1	

1	Α	My signature.
2	Q	Your signature?
3	Α	And I wrote Body-Worn Camera and my P-number.
4	Q	Okay. That's all right here on this disc?
5	Α	That's correct.
6	Q	And you said you wrote your P-number, what's that?
7	Α	That's personnel number, the badge number, as most
8	people (call it.
9	Q	So what is it that's contained on this disc?
10	Α	That shows me arriving in the security office.
11	Q	Are we going to see the defendant on this disc?
12	Α	Yes.
13	Q	And the general scene that you encountered when you
14	arrived?	
15	Α	Correct.
16	Q	And the events depicted here, they're fair and accurate
17	depictio	on of what happened that day when you arrived?
18	Α	Yes.
19	Q	Just to note, is there a small portion of this body-cam
20	video th	at is redacted due to having personal identifying
21	informa	tion, including the serial social security number of the
22	defenda	nnt?
23	Α	Yes.
24	Q	But other than that, that's it?
25	Α	Correct.

1		MR. DICKERSON: At this time, I'm publishing for the
2	membe	ers of the jury State's Exhibit 2.
3		[Video played.]
4		MR. DICKERSON: I'm going to pause this right there.
5	BY MR.	DICKERSON:
6	Q	This is your body cam?
7	Α	Correct.
8	Q	Did you wear it right there in that general area on your
9	shoulde	er, where you wear it here today?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	And where are we right now?
12	А	Back halls through Hawaiian Marketplace. He's guiding
13	me thro	ough to the security office, because I had never been there
14	before.	
15	Q	I take it the individual's a security officer?
16	Α	Correct.
17		[Video played.]
18	Q	That individual that we just saw you walk past, who was
19	that?	
20	А	That was the defendant sitting over there.
21	Q	And that voice that we heard saying, Those motherfuckers
22	are glaz	zed donuts, who was that?
23	Α	That's the defendant.
24		[Video played.]
25	Q	Do you recognize those two individuals, not the police
		61

1	officer that you see there?	
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	And who are those individuals?
4	А	Those would be the Hawaiian Market security guards, the
5	victims.	
6	Q	The two that were injured?
7	А	Correct.
8		[Video played.]
9	Q	That individual that steps outside another security officer?
10	Α	Yes.
11	Q	Not one of the two victims?
12	Α	Correct.
13		[Video played.]
14	Q	And did we just see that small portion where there was
15	persona	I identifying information on it?
16	Α	Yes.
17	Q	Thank you.
18		[Video played.]
19	Q	Officer Simms, those comments that the derogatory
20	terms a	nd the comments, who was the defendant directing those
21	towards	?
22	А	The security officers that were in the room.
23	Q	Chase Lovato?
24	Α	Chase, yes.
25	Q	William Allison?
		62

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	And the individual that we saw in that video with the black
3	Polo and	gold star, who was that?
4	А	That was a patrol detective sergeant.
5	Q	So detectives were called out?
6	А	Correct.
7	Q	Crime scene investigations called out?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	The scene was secured?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	And then were the victims taken to the hospital?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	And what did you do at that point in time?
14	А	I followed the victims to the hospital.
15	Q	That was you followed them?
16	А	Yes, I followed them I followed the ambulance which
17	they wer	e in to the hospital.
18	Q	I see. And, ultimately, during the time of the
19	investiga	ation, the knife was recovered?
20	А	Yes.
21		MS. BROUWERS: Your Honor, I know some of these
22	question	s are foundational, but I'm going to object as to leading.
23		MR. DICKERSON: It's foundational. I think that the
24	objectio	า
25		THE COURT: It is foundational.

1		MR. DICKERSON: the objection's
2		THE COURT: You can lead on foundational questions
3	only, cou	unsel.
4		MR. DICKERSON: I appreciate it, Your Honor.
5	BY MR. I	DICKERSON:
6	Q	And you actually brought the knife into court; is that right?
7	Α	Yes.
8	Q	What is this that I have in my hand?
9	А	It's a box.
10	Q	State's
11	Α	A box
12	Q	State's Exhibit 1. In specific, what is this box?
13	Α	It's evidence.
14		MR. DICKERSON: And may I approach, Your Honor?
15		THE COURT: Yes.
16	BY MR. I	DICKERSON:
17	Q	Is this the evidence that you brought to court?
18	Α	Yes.
19	Q	What is it that we see here?
20	Α	It's a evidence box and it's listed that there's a knife
21	inside.	
22	Q	Okay. This red tape on here, what's that?
23	Α	That's evidence tape.
24	Q	Okay. Is that done to seal the box?
25	Α	Correct.
1	I	

1	Q	And are you able to tell who actually sealed this up?
2	А	Can't read the name, but it was the CSA who responded
3	to the so	cene.
4	Q	Is there some sort of initials and P-number that's used to
5	mark th	ese things?
6	Α	Yes.
7	Q	And what is that? Is that documented on here?
8	Α	Yes, it's M13207M, that two M's would be her initials and
9	the num	ber would be her badge number.
10	Q	And that's located right up here?
11	А	Yes.
12	Q	And when that's done so that M and then the number
13	and then the other M, what is that?	
14	Α	Those are her initials.
15	Q	Okay. Is that a common thing within the Las Vegas
16	Metropo	olitan Police Department?
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	Showing you here the box that we've opened by
19	stipulati	on here; do you see that same number on the knife?
20	А	Yes.
21	Q	And the same initials?
22	Α	Correct.
23	Q	That being the CSA's?
24	Α	Yes.
25	Q	Marking this particular knife that's being impounded by
1	i	

1	her; is t	hat right?
2	Α	Yes.
3	Q	And this knife, it's marked as State's Exhibit 1A, that
4	consist	ent with the description of the knife that's here on the
5	impour	nd box?
6	Α	Yes.
7		MR. DICKERSON: State will pass the witness.
8		THE COURT: Any cross-examination by the Defense?
9		MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
10		If I could approach your clerk just about some exhibits.
11		CROSS-EXAMINATION
12	BY MS.	BROUWERS:
13	Q	Good afternoon, Officer.
14	А	Good afternoon.
15	Q	So I'm going to try to hopefully we can do this without
16	having	to play the video all the way through again, but if we need
17	to, we v	vill.
18	Α	Okay.
19	Q	But, obviously, you recall having watched that video just a
20	momer	nt ago?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. I'm assuming you were paying attention to it, you
23	were as	sked some questions?
24	Α	Yes.
25	Q	Okay. And, obviously, you were there on the scene, so

you also	have an independent recollection
А	Yes.
Q	of what happened?
А	Yes.
Q	Okay. When you first entered through the security office,
you saw	Mr. Edwards sitting there in the chair, correct?
А	Yes.
Q	Okay. No one was administering to him, correct?
Α	Correct.
Q	Okay. But he did have injuries?
Α	Yes.
Q	Injuries that
Α	He
Q	He had injuries that you could see?
Α	He was bleeding from the head, I really couldn't tell where
it was co	oming from.
Q	Bleeding from the head? Okay.
	Prior to you arriving, had you been aware that he had
been ma	aced?
Α	Yes.
Q	Okay. So you knew that?
Α	Yes.
Q	What are the physical effects of mace?
Α	Affects your breathing and your eyesight. It's really
irritating	J.
	A Q A Q you saw A Q A Q A it was co Q been ma A Q A Q A A Q A A Q A A A Q A A A A Q A

1	Q	Okay. Does it affect fair to say it affects kind of your
2	mucous	membranes in general; would it affect your mouth if it got
3	in your r	mouth?
4	Α	Yes.
5	Q	Would it affect your nose if it got in your nose?
6	Α	Yes.
7	Q	And it affects your eyes, you just said?
8	Α	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. Incredibly painful?
10	Α	Yes.
11	Q	Very irritating?
12	А	Yes.
13	Q	Causes your eyes to turn red?
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. And you did have the opportunity to encounter
16	Mr. Edw	ards, obviously, through the course of your investigation?
17	А	Yes.
18	Q	Okay. And I'm going to show you what has been
19	admitted	d as Defense Exhibit B per stipulation. That's Mr. Edwards,
20	correct?	
21	А	Yes.
22	Q	Is that how he looked on the day that you encountered
23	him, this	s day?
24	Α	Yes.
25	Q	Okay. Do you notice some reddening in his eyes?

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	Is that consistent with having been maced?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. Can you see a little bit of mucous around the nose
5	and face	e area?
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	Okay. Is that consistent with being maced?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. And then there's also blood, correct?
10	А	Correct.
11	Q	Okay. Now, you didn't take these photos, but you were
12	but thes	e are consistent with the way he looked when you saw him,
13	correct?	
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. Showing you what's been I apologize admitted
16	as Defer	nse Exhibit B per stipulation; it's Mr. Edwards again, yes?
17	Α	Yes.
18	Q	Okay. There's some blood on the right side of his face?
19	Α	Yes.
20	Q	Okay. Again, you can see some kind of mucous coming
21	out of th	ie nose area?
22	Α	Yes.
23	Q	Okay. And that again, that mucous is consistent with
24	having b	peen maced?
25	Α	Yes.

1	Q	Okay. In the video I'm sorry, I'm going to show these
2	ones to	0.
3		I'm showing you what's been admitted as Defense Exhibit
4	E. I'm g	oing to back out a little bit so you can see. Okay. And that
5	is Mr. E	dwards again, yes?
6	А	Yes.
7	Q	Okay. This is a close-up of the left side of his face?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. He appears to have some kind of cut or abrasion
10	where it	s's bleeding fairly profusely?
11	Α	Yes.
12	Q	Okay. And there's also blood around the bridge of his
13	nose an	d his eyebrow area?
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	Some mucous coming out of his nose area?
16	Α	Yes. Sorry, yes.
17	Q	I'm sorry. It's okay. If you need water, I think other
18	people I	nave been using it too, so.
19		Showing you what's been admitted as Defense Exhibit F.
20	This is j	ust a little bit of a closer-up view of that, correct?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	Can you tell me what this is?
23	А	lt's a ruler, angle point ruler.
24	Q	Okay. What's the purpose of that ruler?
25	Α	Just to show that the width or the length of a injury or
	Ĭ.	

1	object.	
2	Q	Okay. Is this side in centimeters or are they both in
3	centime	ters?
4	А	I can't tell.
5	Q	Okay. Hard to tell on this ELMO, right?
6		Do you mind if I approach?
7	Α	Sure.
8		MS. BROUWERS: Your Honor, I'm going to approach.
9		THE COURT: Yes.
10		MS. BROUWERS: Thank you.
11	BY MS. BROUWERS:	
12	Q	Kind of glare on that. Can you take a look at that for me?
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	Okay. So fair to say that the measurements on both sides
15	are in ce	entimeters?
16	Α	Yes.
17	Q	Okay. Using that ruler, can you tell for me, if you can,
18	what the	e width or length of that injury is?
19	Α	Looks to be about 1 centimeter.
20	Q	Okay. You think it's about 1 centimeter, it looks like a
21	pretty g	ood amount of blood?
22	Α	Yes.
23	Q	Okay. You recall in the video that we just watched,
24	Mr. Edw	ards was pretty we'll call it talkative.
25	А	Yes.
1	1	

1	Q	He was talking pretty much consistently throughout the
2	entire v	ideo?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. He was making and some of the statements you
5	heard w	vere that he was 125 pounds?
6	Α	Yes.
7	Q	Okay. And you, obviously, did have the chance to observe
8	Mr. Edv	vards?
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	Showing you what's been admitted as Defense Exhibit C.
11	Zoomin	g out again. Okay. This is Mr. Edwards, correct?
12	Α	Yes.
13	Q	Okay. He's missing a sock, it looks like. You have to say
14	yes.	
15	Α	Yes. Yes.
16	Q	All right. And does he look to be roughly 125 pounds in
17	your est	timation?
18		MR. DICKERSON: Calls for speculation, Your Honor.
19		THE WITNESS: Yes. Sure.
20		THE COURT: It's I'll allow it. She asked in his
21	estimati	on. Overruled.
22		THE WITNESS: I would guess closer to 140, if
23	BY MS.	BROUWERS:
24	Q	Okay. How much and no offense, how much do you
25	weigh,	Officer?

1	Α	I weigh 280.
2	Q	Okay. And how tall are you?
3	Α	6-1.
4	Q	Okay. In relation to you, how tall was Mr. Edwards? If
5	to your	estimation?
6	А	5-5.
7	Q	Okay. So pretty significantly shorter than you?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	Okay. And you said you're 6-1?
10	А	Correct.
11	Q	Were the officers the security officers that you were
12	there I'm sorry.	
13		Were the security officers who were the alleged victims in
14	this case	e, were they roughly your height?
15	А	I believe William was maybe taller than me. I don't think
16	Lovato	was close to my height or weight.
17	Q	Okay. But you think Mr. Allison might have been bigger?
18	А	Taller, yes.
19	Q	Taller.
20	Α	Yes.
21	Q	Okay. Also in that video, there was a time when I when
22	parame	dics came and were kind of standing near Mr. Edwards; do
23	you rem	nember that in the video?
24	Α	Yes.
25	Q	And you actually directed them to go talk to the security

1	officers instead?	
2	А	Yes.
3	Q	So no one, actually, was administering to Mr. Edwards'
4	head w	ounds?
5	А	Correct, at the time. In the video, yes.
6	Q	In the video that we watched, okay?
7	А	Yes.
8	Q	And no one was administering to any of the injuries he
9	sustained as a result of being maced?	
10	А	Correct.
11	Q	And as you just said, when paramedics went to go look at
12	him, you said, no, no, over there, basically?	
13	Α	Yes.
14	Q	Okay. At a certain point, he at a certain point he asked
15	for som	ne tissue?
16	Α	Correct.
17	Q	Okay. He had mucous all over his face, yes?
18	Α	Yes.
19	Q	Okay. And that was consistent, again, with having been
20	maced	previously?
21	Α	Yes.
22	Q	Okay. The injuries you observed well, did you have the
23	opportu	unity to observe the injuries to the security officers?
24	А	When I was at the hospital, yes.
25	Q	Okay. Those injuries were fairly minor?

1		MR. DICKERSON: Objection. Calls for an expert opinion.
2		THE COURT: We'll allow it, overruled.
3		THE WITNESS: I don't think I would call getting stabbed
4	minor, ı	no.
5	BY MS.	BROUWERS:
6	Q	Okay. You have to prepare reports when
7	А	Sure.
8	Q	investigate a case; is that correct?
9	Α	Yes.
10	Q	Okay. And those are written reports?
11	А	Yes.
12	Q	Okay. In those written reports, you try to be as accurate
13	and detail-oriented as possible?	
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	It's important to get these facts correct?
16	Α	Yes.
17	Q	If you were to get the facts wrong, then something bad
18	could h	appen in terms of any kind of criminal case that was being
19	investig	ated?
20	Α	Yes.
21	Q	Okay. I'm going to ask you to take a look at this, please,
22	sir.	
23	А	Okay.
24	Q	Do you recognize that?
25	А	Yes.
	1	

1	Q	Can you tell me what that is?
2	А	The narrative of the incident crime report that I typed up.
3	Q	Okay. And the narrative you wrote?
4	А	Yes.
5	Q	Okay. Showing you paragraph we'll count it down, one,
6	two, thr	ee showing you paragraph 3, how did you characterize
7	those in	juries?
8	А	They were released with minor injuries.
9	Q	With minor injuries?
10	Α	Yes.
11	Q	Those are words you typed?
12	Α	Yes.
13	Q	And you had followed them to the you had followed the
14	security	officers to the hospital?
15	Α	Yes.
16	Q	Okay. Do you know whether Mr. Edwards was ever
17	transpo	rted to a hospital, if you know?
18	Α	No idea.
19	Q	He wasn't transported or you don't know?
20	Α	I have no idea, I don't know.
21	Q	Okay.
22		MS. BROUWERS: Court's indulgence.
23	Q	When you were taking Mr. Edwards you needed to get
24	his infor	mation and he provided that to you, correct?
25	А	Yes.
1	1	

1	Q	His personal information, and that was part that was	
2	redacte	d?	
3	Α	Correct.	
4	Q	Okay. Do you recall how old he was?	
5	А	I don't recall.	
6	Q	Okay.	
7		MS. BROUWERS: Court's indulgence.	
8	Q	Oh, actually, you know what? We can go ahead and use	
9	that.		
10		MS. BROUWERS: I'm showing this, okay?	
11		MS. DERJAVINA: Uh-huh.	
12	BY MS. BROUWERS:		
13	Q	I'm showing you again that statement that I showed you	
14	just a moment ago. And I'm going to direct you I think yes,		
15	thank yo	ou so much to paragraph 1. I when you got his	
16	informa	tion, he gave you his date of birth?	
17	А	Yes. 8/24/1959.	
18	Q	1959, and this happened in June of 2017?	
19	A	Correct.	
20	Q	Okay. I'm horrible at math.	
21	A	Me too.	
22	Q	You too?	
23	А	Yes.	
24	Q	Okay. So but if he's born in 1959, and this occurred	
25	in 19 l	'm sorry, in 2017, fair to say he's over 55?	

1	А	Yes.
2	Q	Okay. And did you get the information from the security
3	officers	about their dates of birth?
4	А	I was given their Nevada IDs.
5	Q	Okay. So you retrieved information concerning their
6	dates of	birth?
7	Α	Yes.
8	Q	Okay. Do you recall what their ages were?
9	Α	They were in their 20s.
10	Q	Okay. Late 20s, mid-20s, early 20s?
11	А	I don't recall. I would guess mid-20s.
12	Q	Would it refresh your recollection to see those to see
13	this statement again?	
14	Α	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. Thank you.
16	Α	Born in '94 and '95.
17	Q	Okay. And which individual was born in '94, sir I'm
18	sorry, O	fficer.
19	Α	William Allison was born in '94.
20	Q	Okay. So that would make him how old in 2017?
21	Α	23.
22	Q	And as to Mr. Lovato?
23	Α	22, 23, around there. Early 20s.
24	Q	Early 20s, both of them?
25	Α	Yes.
	1	7.0

1	Q	And Mr. Edwards is 50 was over 55?
2	Α	Yes.
3	Q	Okay.
4		MS. BROUWERS: Court's indulgence.
5		I'll pass the witness, thank you.
6		THE COURT: State, any redirect?
7		MR. DICKERSON: No redirect, Your Honor.
8		THE COURT: Can this witness be excused?
9		MR. DICKERSON: This witness can be excused.
10		THE COURT: Sir, thank you.
11		MR. DICKERSON: Looks like we have a question, Your
12	Honor.	
13		THE COURT: I'm sorry. I apologize. You need to raise
14	your har	nd. I glance over there and if I don't see a hand raised, I
15	move or	n. So.
16		[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
17		THE COURT: There's just two?
18		MS. ODEH: There's one right in front of you.
19		THE COURT: Oh, where? Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize. I
20	thought	there was three. Okay.
21		The first one is: What is the definition of brandishing a
22	weapon	and is holding/showing a butt of a knife brandishing a
23	weapon	?
24		MR. DICKERSON: Improper legal conclusion.
25		MS. BROUWERS: I think that's a legal

1	THE COURT: Yeah, I don't believe this is a factual
2	question.
3	MS. BROUWERS: Correct.
4	THE COURT: So I'm not going to give that question.
5	MS. BROUWERS: Agreed.
6	THE COURT: Is agreed by counsel?
7	MS. BROUWERS: Yes.
8	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Okay. What is the length of the knife blade?
10	I don't have a problem with that, if he knows. The knife is in
11	evidence.
12	MR. DICKERSON: Yeah.
13	MS. ODEH: I don't care. That's fine.
14	THE COURT: So you have no objection to me asking that
15	question?
16	MR. DICKERSON: Sure. That's fine.
17	MS. BROUWERS: No objection.
18	MS. ODEH: Yeah, that's fine.
19	THE COURT: Okay. I'll ask that one.
20	Was Mr. Toyer Edwards I think they're trying to say
21	DNA, it says DRNA.
22	MS. DERJAVINA: What?
23	THE COURT: I think they're asking was Mr. Toyer
24	Edwards DRNA tested after incident? If yes, was something found
25	in his system?

1	MS. ODEH: Oh.
2	MS. DERJAVINA: Oh.
3	MR. DICKERSON: I think it's probably improper. We don't
4	want to get into whether he's under the influence.
5	THE COURT: Okay. This, counsel
6	MS. BROUWERS: I
7	MR. DICKERSON: But I mean
8	MS. BROUWERS: I don't think it's a proper question
9	either.
10	THE COURT: Okay. So both counsel are requesting that I
11	not ask that question because it's an improper question; is that
12	correct?
13	MR. DICKERSON: Yeah. Because if we do, it'll open the
14	door to all kinds of questions.
15	THE COURT: I agree.
16	MS. BROUWERS: Yeah.
17	THE COURT: So if both counsel object, I'm not going to
18	ask the question.
19	MS. BROUWERS: Okay.
20	THE COURT: It's an improper question.
21	MS. BROUWERS: Okay.
22	THE COURT: And so the only question I'm going to ask is
23	the knife blade, correct?
24	MS. DERJAVINA: That's fine.
25	MS. ODEH: Uh-huh.

1	MR. DICKERSON: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.
2	MS. BROUWERS: Thank you.
3	THE COURT: Thank you. And then, obviously, both
4	counsel will have the opportunity to do follow-up questions.
5	MR. DICKERSON: Thank you very much.
6	THE COURT: Thank you.
7	[End of bench conference.]
8	THE COURT: Sir?
9	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir?
10	THE COURT: Officer, what is the length of the knife blade?
11	THE WITNESS: It was listed as approximately 3-1/2 inches
12	long.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
14	MR. DICKERSON: Nothing from the State, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Anything from the Defense?
16	MS. BROUWERS: No, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Can this witness be excused?
18	MR. DICKERSON: This witness can be excused.
19	THE COURT: Sir, thank you.
20	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
21	THE COURT: You can be excused.
22	THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
23	THE COURT: State, any additional witnesses?
24	MR. DICKERSON: Just briefly, may we approach your
25	clerk, Your Honor?

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	1

THE COURT: You may.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Counsel, I'm going to take my evening -- my afternoon recess at this point.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

THE COURT: Or -- before we get started on the next witness.

MR. DICKERSON: I think that there's a good chance -we're just double-checking to make sure that everything's been
admitted, then we'll rest.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm going to take our afternoon recess at this time.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to take a 15-minute recess. During this recess, you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial, or read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspapers, television, radio, or Internet, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

We'll be in recess for 15 minutes.

[Court recessed at 3:24 p.m., until 3:40 p.m.]
[Outside the presence of the jury.]

1	THE COURT: This is the continuation of the trial of State
2	of Nevada versus Toyer Edwards, Case Number C-324805.
3	State, do you have any additional witnesses or are you
4	resting?
5	MR. DICKERSON: State
6	MS. DERJAVINA: No, I
7	MR. DICKERSON: The State is going to rest. We would
8	just ask that maybe now's a good time for the defendant to be
9	admonished.
10	THE COURT: I agree.
11	MS. BROUWERS: So do we. Huzzah.
12	THE COURT: Mr. Edwards, under the Constitution of the
13	United States and under the Constitution of State of Nevada, you
14	cannot be compelled to testify in this case; do you understand that?
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
16	THE COURT: You may, at your own request, give up this
17	right and take the witness stand and testify. If you do, you'll be
18	subject to cross-examination by the deputy district attorney and
19	anything that you may say, be it on direct or cross-examination, will
20	be the subject of fair comment when the deputy district attorney
21	speaks to the jury in his or her final argument. Do you understand
22	that?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
24	THE COURT: If you choose not to testify, the Court will
25	not permit the deputy district attorney to make any comments to

the jury because you have not testified; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: If you elect not to testify, the Court will instruct the jury, but only if your attorneys specifically request it as follows:

The law does not compel a defendant in a criminal case to take the stand and testify, and no presumption may be raised and no inference of any kind may be drawn from the failure of a defendant to testify.

Do you have any questions about these rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Not at all.

THE COURT: You are further advised that if you have a felony conviction and more than 10 days has not elapsed from the date you have been convicted or discharged from prison, parole, or probation, whichever is later, and the Defense has not sought to preclude that coming before the jury, and you elect to take the stand and testify, the deputy district attorney, in the presence of the jury, will be permitted to ask the following:

- 1. Have you been convicted of a felony?
- 2. What was the felony?

And 3. When did it happen?

However, no details may be gone into; do you understand that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Defense, do you present -- shucks.

1	Defense, do you intend to present any witnesses?
2	MS. ODEH: No, we don't, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Is the Defense resting at this time?
4	MS. ODEH: We are resting.
5	THE COURT: I was going to excuse the jury then, and we
6	can discuss jury instructions at this point.
7	MR. DICKERSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Is that agreeable to the parties?
9	MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor.
10	MS. ODEH: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Okay. I was I have a matter early in the
12	morning and I believe one the deputy district attorneys also have
13	a matter.
14	MS. DERJAVINA: That's correct, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: What time do you think you'll have your
16	matter completed?
17	MS. DERJAVINA: I'll be here by 9:15.
18	THE COURT: Okay. I was going to start tomorrow
19	at 10:30
20	MS. DERJAVINA: That's fine with the State.
21	THE COURT: if that's agreeable to the parties.
22	MS. BROUWERS: Yes.
23	MS. ODEH: Yes, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: And then so I'm going to excuse the jury
25	at this point and then we'll settle instructions.

1	MS. ODEH: All right. Thank you.
2	MS. DERJAVINA: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
4	Can you bring the jurors back in?
5	THE MARSHAL: When you tell them to come back, would
6	you tell them 10:15
7	THE DEFENDANT: 10:15, I will.
8	THE MARSHAL: because we're having
9	THE COURT: And also, I'm going to ask the questions on
10	the record whether you
11	MS. ODEH: Yes.
12	THE COURT: rest and whether you're going to present
13	any witnesses.
14	MR. DICKERSON: Yes, Your Honor.
15	[Jury reconvened at 3:45 p.m.]
16	THE COURT: Let the record reflect the presence of the
17	counsel for the State, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant.
18	Will the parties stipulate to the presence of the jury?
19	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.
20	MS. ODEH: Yes, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: State, do you have any additional
22	witnesses?
23	MS. DERJAVINA: No, Your Honor. The State rests at this
24	time.
25	THE COURT: Defense, are you going to call any

witnesses?

MS. ODEH: Your Honor, we are not going to call any witnesses. And the Defense would rest at this time, as well.

THE COURT: At this point, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to take our evening recess. I'm going to have you return tomorrow at 10:15. We should start around 10:30. But I would like everybody here at 10:15.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to take our evening recess at this time. During this recess, you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial, or read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with this trial by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspapers, television, radio, or Internet, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted.

We'll be in recess.

I'll see counsel in the conference room.

[Court recessed at 3:48 p.m.]

ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.

Shawna Ortega, CET*562

Electronically Filed 4/14/2021 12:35 PM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

TRAN 1 2 DISTRICT COURT 3 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA 4 5 THE STATE OF NEVADA, 6 Plaintiff(s), Case No. C-17-324805-1 7 VS. Department XXI 8 TOYER EDWARDS, 9 Defendant(s). 10 11 BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK B. BAILUS, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 12 13 FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 2018 14 15 16 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: **JURY TRIAL - DAY 5 of 5** 17 18 19 APPEARANCES: For the Plaintiff(s): EKATERINA DERJAVINA, ESQ. 20 MICHAEL DICKERSON, ESQ. **Deputy District Attorneys** 21 22 For the Defendant(s): ELAINE ODEH, ESQ. SHANA S. BROUWERS, ESQ. 23 **Deputy Public Defenders**

RECORDED BY: JESSICA KIRKPATRICK, COURT RECORDER

24

25

Τ

INDEX Page # Closing Argument for the State Closing Argument for the Defendant Rebuttal Closing Argument for the State Verdict EXHIBITS No exhibits offered.

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 2018

[Proceeding commenced at 10:19 a.m.]

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: This is a continuation of the trial of State of Nevada versus Toyer Edwards, Case Number C-17-324805. Let the record reflect the presence of counsel for the State, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant. The jury is not present. This is time set for settling of instructions.

Counsel, it's my understanding that the instructions submitted by the State that we'll be reviewing this morning -- where are they? -- were the ones that were submitted this morning; is that correct?

MS. DERJAVINA: That's correct, Your Honor.

MR. DICKERSON: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And then the State also has supplemental instructions that were submitted this morning; is that correct?

MS. DERJAVINA: That's correct.

MR. DICKERSON: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And as for the Defense, the instructions that the Defense are proposing were the ones that were submitted this morning also; is that correct?

MS. BROUWERS: Your Honor, we also have the ones that we originally filed last week on Friday.

THE COURT: You also requesting those?

1	MS. BROUWERS: There are some that are covered by the
2	State, but there are some that we have that are a little bit different.
3	And so I want just to be heard on those ones when we get there.
4	THE COURT: Absolutely. What I was going to do is go
5	through the State's initial ones and see if you have an objection to
6	what the State's proposed.
7	MS. BROUWERS: Okay.
8	THE COURT: Okay. As to Instruction Number 1, it begins:
9	It is now my duty as judge.
10	Any objection by either party to that proposed instruction?
11	MS. BROUWERS: No.
12	MR. DICKERSON: No, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Then I'm going to mark these as we go.
14	So they were unmarked at this point.
15	As to the State's Proposed Instruction Number 2: If in
16	these rules. If in these instructions, any rule
17	Any objection by either party?
18	MS. BROUWERS: No.
19	MR. DICKERSON: No, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: That will be given.
21	Instruction Number 3: An information is but a formal
22	method of accusing a person.
23	Any objection?
24	MS. BROUWERS: No.
25	MR. DICKERSON: No, Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: That instruction will be given.
2	Instruction State's Proposed Instruction Number 4: To
3	constitute the crime charged.
4	Any objection?
5	MS. BROUWERS: No.
6	MR. DICKERSON: No.
7	THE COURT: State's Proposed Instruction Number
8	THE COURT CLERK: Will the previous one be given?
9	THE COURT: Yeah. See previous State's Proposed
10	Instruction Number 4 will be given.
11	State's Proposed Instruction Number 5 begins: The
12	defendant is presumed innocent.
13	MS. BROUWERS: And, Your Honor, we proposed an
14	alternative instruction to that. It's our page 2. So in our original
15	ones that were submitted on the I believe the 23rd.
16	THE COURT: This is the defendant's supplemental
17	proposed jury instructions
18	MS. BROUWERS: No, Your Honor. It's the ones that were
19	submitted on the 23rd. So our original set that was submitted.
20	THE COURT: Hold on.
21	MS. BROUWERS: I can approach you if you need to see it
22	THE COURT: And what page is it on, counsel?
23	MS. BROUWERS: 2, Your Honor. And the language that's
24	different is specifically in paragraph 3. It's that's a correct
25	statement of the law and we're asking for that to be given to the

jury.

MR. DICKERSON: The State objects to that, as the reasonable doubt instruction is statutory and set out as-is in the State's instruction, which is the proper instruction to be given.

THE COURT: As to Defendant's Proposed Instruction

Number 1, that will not be given. It's covered by State's Proposed

Instruction Number 5. As to -- and so State's Proposed Exhibit -
Instruction Number 5 will be given.

State's Proposed Instruction Number 6: You are to determine the guilt or innocence; any objection?

MS. BROUWERS: Your Honor, this is one that we discussed a little bit yesterday and so yes, based upon the fact that there's -- I think it's a little bit confusing and misleading in that there's no codefendant. And so this talks about other people being considered.

MR. DICKERSON: The State submitted, Your Honor, that it is a correct statement of the law and the obvious route that Defense is going to argue is that everybody else in this case is guilty of a crime besides the defendant. For that reason, it's a necessary instruction to have.

THE COURT: Defense, if I do not give this instruction, you will be precluded from arguing that any other person has violated the law. Do you still have an objection to it?

MS. BROUWERS: And, Your Honor, I don't think that that's necessarily an appropriate preclusion. It's not that we're

1	going to be saying that the security officers violated the law, but
2	that they acted improperly. And so
3	MR. DICKERSON: It's precisely why we need the
4	instruction, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: I'll give it.
6	State's Proposed Jury Instruction Number 7: The
7	evidence which you are to consider.
8	Any objection?
9	MS. BROUWERS: No.
10	THE COURT: Instruction Number 7 will be given.
11	State's Proposed Jury Instruction Number 8: The
12	credibility or believability of a witnesses.
13	Any objection?
14	MS. BROUWERS: No.
15	THE COURT: State's Proposed Instruction Number 8 will
16	be given.
17	I believe State's Instruction Number 9 was withdrawn; is
18	that correct? It deals with experts.
19	MR. DICKERSON: That's correct. Or I yeah, that's
20	actually from the original packet that we set over. We were looking
21	at the additional packet that was sent over today that does not have
22	that instruction in it.
23	THE COURT: I apologize, counsel.
24	MS. BROUWERS: All of the instructions have been in that
25	same order so far, though. So we're still fine.

1	MR. DICKERSON: Yes, absolutely.
2	THE COURT: All right. So it should be Proposed Jury
3	Instruction Number 9: Battery means any willful and lawful?
4	MR. DICKERSON: Correct, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
6	MS. BROUWERS: No objection.
7	THE COURT: That instruction will be given.
8	Instruction State's Proposed Instruction Number 10: If
9	you find the defendant is guilty of battery.
0	Any objection?
1	MS. BROUWERS: No objection to that one. But, Your
2	Honor, I don't know if it would make sense now to look well,
3	because we're numbering them in the order we want them, is that
4	THE COURT: These are just proposed instructions.
5	MS. BROUWERS: Okay. All right.
6	THE COURT: I'm going to we're going to redo the
7	numbering once we address your instructions, counsel.
8	MS. BROUWERS: Okay. Never mind. That's perfectly
9	fine, then. Yeah. No objection to 10.
20	THE COURT: And so Defendant's shucks.
21	The State's Proposed Instruction Number 10 will be given.
22	State's Proposed Instruction Number 11: If you find the
23	defendant it guilty of battery.
24	Any objection?
25	MS. BROUWERS: No.

THE COURT: That instruction will be given.

State's Proposed Instruction Number 12: An owner or occupant of land.

MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor. We have an objection to this one. This is, basically, what the -- what this one is doing is instructing the jury to find him guilty of a trespass which hasn't been charged. And I think that's confusing. Additionally, it gives -- it's making them -- it's forcing the jury to draw the legal conclusion that the security officers had a right to be asking him to leave. And I think that's a matter that should be left for the juries -- the jury to be -- to consider on their own about what they believe the conduct was appropriate or not. And as he has not been charged with a trespass, I think it's improper to instruct on a trespass.

MR. DICKERSON: And, Your Honor, what Defense counsel's argued is that this requires the jury to make a legal conclusion. That's not the jury's role. The jury is the finder of fact. The jury needs to be instructed on the law. This is the law. This is the law that's the basis for the arrest and ultimately the force that can be used during the rest, and thereto, the resisting that may come from an arrest if it's unlawful.

That's why the jury needs to be instructed on this law, because the jury is not the judge of the law. That's your job. And that's why you need to instruct them on this and they can apply this law to the facts as given. This law allows the jury to see that the -- two security officers had the right to demand that the defendant

leave property. Ultimately, the defendant acting as he did, was the original aggressor in this entire matter, given that fact, that these two officers had the ability and the right to ask him to leave. And then after his refusal to leave, he was trespassing, which then gave them the right, as a private citizen, to effect an arrest, because he was committing a public offense in their presence.

For that reason, Your Honor, the jury needs to be instructed on this. If they are not instructed on this, the Defense has to be precluded from arguing that the defendant wasn't trespassing and that he's not the original aggressor, namely.

MS. BROUWERS: And, Your Honor, my concern --

THE COURT: Counsel.

MS. BROUWERS: Yes?

THE COURT: Go ahead, make a record. I just have some follow-up questions.

MS. BROUWERS: Sure.

Our concern is that it's instructing the jury that the officers had a right to act in the way that they were. And I think that's a factual situation that the jury needs to be able to determine for theirself -- or for their own, basically.

MR. DICKERSON: And that's why it should be given. It's not instructing them the officers were acting appropriately. That would be an instruction that said the officers had the right to arrest him. This is an instruction that is simply the law. And that's for the jury to decide whether those officers were, in fact, following the law

1	when they effected the arrest on him.
2	THE COURT: All right. Counsel, I this particular
3	instruction also coincides with another set of instructions the State
4	has submitted. If you could if counsel could turn to State's
5	supplemental instructions to the jury.
6	MS. BROUWERS: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Do you have those in front of you?
8	MS. BROUWERS: Yes.
9	THE COURT: If you could look at the State's
10	Supplemental Instructions Number 1 and Number 2.
11	Number State's Supplemental Instruction Number 1:
12	Arrest is taking of a person into custody.
13	And State's Supplemental Instruction Number 2: An
14	arrestee may physically resist.
15	As to State's Supplemental Instruction Number 1, they
16	had put in: The crime of trespass is a public offense.
17	MS. BROUWERS: Correct.
18	THE COURT: I was going to modify that that the State
19	trespassing is a public offense.
20	MR. DICKERSON: Okay.
21	THE COURT: If you take this instruction with the State's
22	Supplemental Instruction Number 1 and State's Supplemental
23	Instruction Number 2, and again, I may modify State's
24	Supplemental Instruction Number 2, this seems to be consistent
25	with the facts presented in this case and the Defense Resiculty

that an arrestee may physically resist arrest only if the peace officer or private person make the arrest -- and this is State's Supplemental Exhibit Number 2 -- uses force as unlawful and excessive.

If you read the *Batson* decision, 113 Nev. Report, page 669. If you look at Footnote Number 3, it says -- and I'm only going to read it in relevant part: Accordingly, *Smithson* is overruled to the extent it justifies use of any force and response to anything less than a police officer's use of unlawful and excessive force. That appears to be the law.

So what I was -- if you read State's Proposed Instruction
Number 12, State's Supplemental Instruction Number 1, modifying
it where it says, The crime of trespass is a public offense, to say
Trespassing is a public offense.

And then State's Supplemental Proposed Instruction

Number 2, it would say, An arrestee may physically resist arrest
only if the peace officer or private person make or uses force is
unlawful and excessive.

I'm not inclined to give the rest of that sentence.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

THE COURT: And I think if you take those three instructions, that's a correct statement of the law and coincides with the facts that were presented in this case, counsel.

MS. BROUWERS: Okay. So it's my understanding those are being given over --

MS. ODEH: Just, I just -- there's one issue on State's

1	Proposed Number 12.
2	THE COURT: Yes.
3	MS. ODEH: So if that instruction is going to be given, I
4	would ask that the warning be defined. What does the warning
5	have to contain?
6	MR. DICKERSON: It's very clear. It's an oral or written
7	demand of any person on property to vacate the property. It's right
8	there in the instruction, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: How about after being given such demand
0	rather than warning, counsel?
1	MR. DICKERSON: Yeah, sure. That's State has no
2	objection to that.
3	MS. BROUWERS: Okay.
4	THE COURT: Do you want warning or demand? I
5	recognize you're objecting to it, but do you want warning or
6	demand?
7	MS. BROUWERS: I think demand, just to be consistent
8	between the two parts of the sentence.
9	MS. ODEH: Right.
20	THE COURT: Okay. State, if you can make those
21	modifications to State's Proposed Instruction Number 12, changing
22	the word Warning in the third sentence on line 4 to the word
23	Demand.
24	And then on State's Supplemental Instruction Number 1,
25	on line 5, where it says: The crime of trespass; change deleting

1	that and changing it to trespass.
2	And then on State's Supplemental Instruction Number 2,
3	on line 3, I believe consistent with <i>Batson</i> Footnote Number 3, if we
4	end it at the word excessive.
5	MR. DICKERSON: Okay.
6	MS. DERJAVINA: Okay.
7	MR. DICKERSON: Noted, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Okay. So those instructions will be given as
9	modified. All right.
10	As to State's Proposed Instruction Number 13: Although
11	you are to consider only the evidence.
12	Any objection?
13	MS. BROUWERS: No.
14	THE COURT: That instruction will be given.
15	As to State's Proposed Instruction Number 14
16	MS. ODEH: No objection.
17	THE COURT: in your deliberation no objection?
18	MS. ODEH: No objection.
19	THE COURT: That instruction will be given.
20	State's Proposed Instruction Number 15: During the
21	course of this trial.
22	Any objection?
23	MS. BROUWERS: No objection.
24	THE COURT: That instruction will be given.
25	State's Proposed Instruction Number 16: When you retire

1	Any objection?
2	MS. BROUWERS: No objection. No.
3	THE COURT: That instruction will be given.
4	State's Proposed Instruction Number 17: If, during your
5	deliberation.
6	MS. BROUWERS: No objection.
7	THE COURT: That instruction will be given.
8	And then State's Instruction Proposed Instruction
9	Number 18: Now you will listen to arguments.
10	Any objection?
11	MS. BROUWERS: No objection.
12	THE COURT: That instruction will be given.
13	As to the State's verdict form, any objection?
14	MS. BROUWERS: Sorry, Court's indulgence. I had flipped
15	away from it.
16	Your Honor, we proposed a different verdict form. It was,
17	basically, going in the other direction. So, well, actually
18	MS. DERJAVINA: And, Your Honor, the State actually
19	has I realized it was our mistake, has no objection to switching
20	out going from battery to and kind of going upwards.
21	THE COURT: So it would be not guilty
22	MS. DERJAVINA: Guilty of battery.
23	THE COURT: guilty of battery
24	MS. DERJAVINA: Guilty of
25	THE COURT: guilty and that's somewhat what the

Defense had proposed, except they capitalize the words Not Guilty and I wasn't going to do that.

MR. DICKERSON: Yeah, we were objecting.

MS. DERJAVINA: And that was our objection for theirs, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So with that --

MR. DICKERSON: In addition, Your Honor, we would move Count 2 to its own page.

THE COURT: Okay. And so with that understanding, that the first box will be not guilty;

The second box will be guilty of battery;

Third box will be guilty of battery resulting in substantial bodily harm;

The fourth box will be guilty of battery with use of a deadly weapon;

And the fifth box will be guilty of battery with use a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm.

That'll be the order of the verdict forms.

MS. BROUWERS: Okay. And, Your Honor, I just -- just so the record is clear, I -- that's pretty consistent with the verdict form that we proposed in our supplemental, but it's, obviously, very different than the one we proposed in our original. The original was prepared because we were not intending to ask for a lesser included. It's my understanding the State has requested the lesser includeds, and over our objection, we prepared the form because

Your Honor indicated that you were going to do -- that you were going to allow them to have the lessers in there.

THE COURT: That's correct, counsel. It's my understanding that the State is asking that the lesser includeds me included -- be -- that the jury be permitted to deliberate regarding the lesser included offenses. Is it -- that's State's request?

MR. DICKERSON: Pursuant to NRS 175.501, that was a State's request as to battery with use of a deadly -- or, yeah, battery with use of a deadly weapon, battery/substantial bodily harm. Ultimately, Defense counsel did end up requesting the misdemeanor battery as a lesser included. And the State objected to that, as there's no evidence that there was a misdemeanor battery alone committed.

THE COURT: And I'm going to include the misdemeanor battery, counsel.

Counsel, do you disagree with Mr. Dickerson's recitation of the facts regarding the lesser included?

MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor. If the lesser -- if the State's going to be requesting lesser includeds, I think we need to go all the way down to the misdemeanor, as well. And so --

THE COURT: But what he stated --

MS. BROUWERS: Oh, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: -- was they did not request the battery, and as a result of the State's request, it was your position if we're going to do that, you also -- you requested the misdemeanor battery.

MS. BROUWERS: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. BROUWERS: I apologize if I misunderstood your first question.

MS. ODEH: That's fine.

THE COURT: So with that modification, that'll be the verdict form in this case.

On the State's supplemental instructions, we've already addressed instructions -- State's Proposed Supplemental Instructions Number 1 and Number 2.

On the State's Supplemental Instruction Number 3, is there any objection?

MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor. I don't believe this is an appropriate instruction, based upon the case law cited by the State. The *State v Wedel* case refers to deadly force in making an arrest. Not -- deadly force and use of -- and any kind of self-defense or defense of others.

And then the *Newell versus State* is -- has to do with use of force and resisting the commission of a felony. So I don't think that that's appropriate either. They don't -- it doesn't fit with the facts of this particular case.

And I believe the parenthetical after the *Brooks v Sheriff* citation is correct. But as far as the application of *State v Wedel* and *Newell v State* to this case, I think it's inappropriate, because it has to do with --

1	THE COURT: What is your specific objection to the
2	language, counsel? What part of the instruction are you asking to
3	be modified?
4	MS. BROUWERS: I don't think the instruction should be
5	given at all.
6	MR. DICKERSON: It's a proper statement of the law, Your
7	Honor.
8	MS. BROUWERS: Based upon case law that's totally
9	inapplicable to
10	THE COURT: Well, they cite Runyan and they cite
11	Gonzalez, and that case law is applicable.
12	MS. BROUWERS: We're talking about the it says deadly
13	forces as a matter of law unreasonable. That's the
14	THE COURT: Hold on.
15	MS. BROUWERS: State's Supplemental 3, I believe.
16	THE COURT: Did you submit a self-defense instruction,
17	counsel?
18	MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor. We have submitted
19	self-defense instructions.
20	MR. DICKERSON: And this is a correct statement of law
21	whether it be for an arrest of self-defense, that the person
22	perceiving the threat has to be perceiving a threat of imminent
23	substantial bodily harm or death to use deadly force. It's applicable
24	to this situation as well as the others that Defense counsel has
25	mentioned.

THE COURT: Counsel, where's your proposed self-defense instruction covering this?

MS. BROUWERS: We have -- I -- so in our original, and actually since we're in the State's packet, we can refer to that one in just a moment as well, but in our original packet, we submitted some instructions concerning self-defense. And I believe those are on our pages 9 through 13.

And, based upon the discussions that we had between the parties and Your Honor yesterday, when you raised the issue of wanting to make sure that all of the *Runyan* instructions had been covered, I worked -- the State and I worked together to make sure that we were covering all of those. And so in the State's supplemental packet, I believe it's starting on their next page. So their Supplemental Proposed 4 through -- just up until the penultimate one, basically --

THE COURT: So --

MS. BROUWERS: -- have been agreed between the parties.

THE COURT: -- State's Supplemental Instructions

Number 4, 5, 6, and 7 have been agreed to as -- is that correct?

MS. BROUWERS: 4, 5, 6, and 7, yes, have been agreed to.
This -- in -- out of the State's supplemental packet. And I believe that those are consistent with *Runyan*, and both parties agreed on that.

MS. DERJAVINA: That's correct, Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: Okay. As to State's Supplemental
2	Instructions Number 4, 5, 6, and 7, those instructions will be given.
3	And also on State's Proposed Instruction Number 8, a
4	portion of the video, I assume that there's no objection to that, on
5	State's Supplemental Instruction Number 8, a portion of the video
6	audit contained has been redacted?
7	MS. BROUWERS: I don't believe that that's I don't
8	believe that that would be 8, but as to that
9	THE COURT: It's State's Supplemental Instruction
10	Number 8. It's right after the self-defense instructions.
11	MS. BROUWERS: Well, the ones that we the ones that I
12	specifically had no objection to based upon them coming out of
13	Runyan, were 4, 5, 6 and 7. But there are
14	THE COURT: No, no. This has nothing to do with Runyan
15	It's just I
16	MR. DICKERSON: You know, Your Honor
17	MS. BROUWERS: No, it's just I don't think we're
18	MS. DERJAVINA: I think you might be looking at
19	MR. DICKERSON: I think that's the previously
20	submitted
21	MS. BROUWERS: Sorry.
22	MR. DICKERSON: State's supplemental.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, I have several supplemental.
24	Can you do you have an extra copy
25	MS. DERJAVINA: I

1	THE COURT: of the one that you have?
2	MS. DERJAVINA: May I approach, Your Honor?
3	THE COURT: Yes, you may. Thank you, counsel.
4	MS. DERJAVINA: And I believe, for the record, everything
5	that was discussed in the supplemental up to this point has been
6	correct regarding the numbering of it.
7	THE COURT: All right. Counsel can both counsel
8	approach the bench.
9	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes.
10	THE COURT: Let's make sure.
11	All right. So this is your old one, the one I was going off
12	of. All right. So is this this has your writing on it. Do you have
13	an extra copy, a clean copy?
14	MR. DICKERSON: I don't.
15	THE COURT: Hold on. Let me see if I can find that. All
16	right. I don't have a law clerk, so I've been trying to do this on my
17	own.
18	Can you tell me if this is the one we're going off of?
19	MR. DICKERSON: No, that's the old one.
20	MS. DERJAVINA: Yeah, this is the old one.
21	THE COURT: All right. Shannon.
22	THE COURT CLERK: Yes?
23	THE COURT: Make a give me which is the one we're
24	going off of? Do you have it right here?
25	MR. DICKERSON: I have this one. It does have

1	MS. DERJAVINA: Writing on it too.
2	MR. DICKERSON: just given, if objected, and then we'll
3	exchange.
4	THE COURT: All right. So this is not the right one,
5	though, the one I've been going off of? It's not the right one? Or is
6	that yours that you just gave me?
7	MS. DERJAVINA: No, that one is the one that you're
8	holding right now is the one.
9	THE COURT: Okay.
10	MR. DICKERSON: This is not the right one.
11	THE COURT: All right. Is there anything on this that you
12	don't want me to see for - is it clean? Or is there anything on this
13	you don't want me to see?
14	MS. DERJAVINA: No, it's just the changes that you told
15	us to make.
16	THE COURT: All right. Go make me a copy of this real
17	quick.
18	l apologize.
19	MR. DICKERSON: Sorry, Your Honor.
20	MS. BROUWERS: We've been sending a lot of e-mails.
21	And all calling them the same thing.
22	THE COURT: Well.
23	MR. DICKERSON: Yeah, I yeah.
24	MS. DERJAVINA: We just this morning tried to send you
25	a file copy of the changes that we've already kind of discussed to

1	expedite things a little bit.
2	THE COURT: Well, all right.
3	MR. DICKERSON: Yeah, I think that once you get that one
4	it will be a lot of the
5	MS. ODEH: Yeah, we'll be able to zoom.
6	MR. DICKERSON: stuff that's
7	THE COURT: Right. And just for the record
8	MS. BROUWERS: Uh-huh.
9	THE COURT: I just want to make sure. And as far as the
10	Defense, this is the correct one; is that correct?
11	MS. BROUWERS: Yes, this is the correct supplemental.
12	THE COURT: And this is your correct initial ones?
13	MS. BROUWERS: Yes. We've only ever submitted just
14	one set of the originals.
15	THE COURT: Okay. So when I
16	MS. BROUWERS: That's correct.
17	THE COURT: When I reference yours, those are the
18	correct ones.
19	MS. BROUWERS: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Okay. And then I've gone through the
21	State's.
22	MS. BROUWERS: Actually, Your Honor, I do apologize.
23	Maybe I should let me take one more look at the supplemental.
24	Because there was the verdict form wouldn't have been the thing
25	that changed between them. It would have been

1	MS. DERJAVINA: Oh, yeah.
2	THE COURT: This has your verdict form on it.
3	MS. BROUWERS: Yeah. Let me just double-triple-check.
4	THE COURT: All right.
5	MS. DERJAVINA: I think it's your Crawford one.
6	MS. BROUWERS: Yeah, I'm just making sure that
7	they're the change that we talked about.
8	MS. DERJAVINA: Okay.
9	MS. BROUWERS: Okay. Yeah.
10	MS. DERJAVINA: The yeah.
11	MS. BROUWERS: We have to add in the words. But,
12	yeah.
13	THE COURT: All right. So while we're doing that, why
14	don't we start going over we'll come back to the State's
15	supplemental.
16	MS. BROUWERS: Okay.
17	THE COURT: Why don't we start going over with your
18	Defendant's Proposed Jury Instructions
19	MS. BROUWERS: Okay.
20	THE COURT: dated March 23.
21	Well, hold on. It looks like we're back.
22	Counsel, approach.
23	Thank you.
24	MS. DERJAVINA: Thank you. Was it just approach to get
25	it?

1	THE COURT: Huh? Yeah, I was just giving her her copy
2	back.
3	MS. DERJAVINA: I just didn't know if you needed us.
4	MS. ODEH: Your Honor, are we going back to the State's
5	supplemental?
6	THE COURT: We will. I just am numbering them and then
7	I'm going to make sure I've okay.
8	So on the State's supplemental instructions, Number 1
9	will be given as modified.
10	Number 2 will be given as modified.
11	MS. DERJAVINA: I don't believe we've decided on
12	Number 3.
13	THE COURT: Number 3
14	MR. DICKERSON: So Number 3 was originally part of the
15	Runyan
16	THE COURT: Well, let me go on the ones we've agreed on
17	before I come back.
18	So we've agreed on to give 4, 5, 6, and 7; is that correct?
19	MS. BROUWERS: That's correct. And, I think I can
20	probably I'll just submit on 8.
21	THE COURT: Number 8 is
22	MS. BROUWERS: Actually, I'll submit on 8, 9, 10, and 11.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, on Number 8, it says: A
24	person may use force in defense of others to the same extent that
25	the person could have used force in self-defense.

That appears to be a correct statement of the law from the *Batson* decision.

MS. BROUWERS: And I'm submitting on it.

THE COURT: It'll be given.

The right to -- of self-defense exists only as long as a real or apparent threat and danger continues to exist. When such danger ceases to appear to exist, the right to use force in self-defense ends.

Is there any objection to this?

MS. BROUWERS: Submit it.

THE COURT: And what authority do you have for that, counsel?

MS. DERJAVINA: Court's --

MR. DICKERSON: It is a correct statement of law under the law that's in *Runyan*, that only as long as the threat exists, you can use that force. And that goes for the actual or apparent threat, which is a correct statement of the law. Anything after that point in time would not be self-defense. So I think that what it does is it just gives a temporal limit to the right to self-defense.

THE COURT: All right. I'll give it.

And then Number 10: The law does not just justify use of greater degree of force than is reasonably necessary, a person act as a -- in self-defense allow to use force in a proportionally reasonable manner to avoid actual or apparent danger.

You're relying upon Runyan; is that correct?

1	MR. DICKERSON: Yes, Your Honor. Runyan and the
2	unpublished decisions for illustration only. Yeah.
3	MS. BROUWERS: Submit it.
4	THE COURT: Okay. It'll be given.
5	Let's go back to State's Supplemental Instruction
6	Number 3.
7	MS. BROUWERS: And, Your Honor, the State had one
8	more. It was 11, and I'm agreeing to that one.
9	MR. DICKERSON: And the only additional on 11 is that
10	the exhibit number is Number 2.
11	MS. BROUWERS: Oh.
12	MR. DICKERSON: So we'll just be adding that in.
13	MS. BROUWERS: Correct.
14	THE COURT: With that modification, it'll be given.
15	State's Supplemental Instruction Number 3.
16	MR. DICKERSON: And, Your Honor, as to Newell v State,
17	Newell v State said that the use of deadly force in response to a
18	felony is only justified when the person poses threat of serious
19	injury. That is especially necessary in light of the fact that Defense
20	counsel's proposed the instruction under NRS 193230, in their
21	original instructions, page 11. The one that the State was asking
22	that we add the By Other Parties language to.
23	It just goes to show it is applicable to this situation as any
24	that deadly force as a matter of law is, in fact, unreasonable unless
25	the threat of substantial bodily harm or death is imminent.

MS. BROUWERS: And, Your Honor, I again, I don't believe that those cases support that under the circumstances of our case, because, again, the *Wedel* case has to do with deadly force being used in the making of an arrest by a police officer. And then the *Newell versus State*, again, has to do with resisting the commission of a felony.

And in this particular case, what the officers were doing was trying to prevent him from doing, you know -- he was committing a misdemeanor, arguably, when they started to use force. And then subsequent to that, when he'd been attacked. But I just don't think that it fits under the circumstances and facts of this particular case. And so that's why I've objected to the instruction in its entirety.

MR. DICKERSON: And one last point is that this does apply to arrest situations and resisting arrest situations.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. DICKERSON: And so the language that you struck from the arrest and what force can be used from resisting arrest, is -- actually, this language is applicable here, that using deadly force to resist arrest cannot be done unless there's an imminent threat of substantial bodily harm or death.

THE COURT: I'm looking at the *Runyan* decision.

Obviously, *Runyan* dealt with a killing, while our case deals with a battery. So I'm going to read this, but I'm going to delete in the *Runyan* decision where they've used the word killing, I'm going to

insert the word battery. The battery -- the battering of another in self-defense is just fine, not unlawful, when the person who does the battery actually and reasonably believes, one, that there is imminent danger that the assailant with either -- and then *Runyan* said Kill him or cause him great bodily injury; and two, that there is -- that it is absolutely necessary under the circumstances for him to use in self-defense force or means that might cause the death of the other person for purpose of avoiding death or great bodily injury to himself.

MS. BROUWERS: And, Your Honor, I think that's one's actually covered by the State's Supplemental 4, which we've agreed to.

Additionally, I think both parties are in agreement that the phrase should not be battery, but it should be use of force.

THE COURT: That's fine. I -- again --

MS. BROUWERS: Yeah, yeah.

THE COURT: I was just trying to --

MS. BROUWERS: Sure. Uh-huh.

MR. DICKERSON: This specifically deals -- this instruction specifically deals with deadly force, which is used in this case, is the fact that there's a deadly weapon used in multiple stabbing inflicted upon these two officers, these two security officers, I should say.

With that, Your Honor, this is a correct statement of the law under *Runyan, Wedel*, and *Newell*. And, specifically, having to do with resisting arrest, that if individual cannot use deadly force to

resist arrest unless they are facing imminent threat of substantial bodily harm or death.

So it goes beyond just the use of force, and specifically addresses what the issue is: Deadly force.

MS. BROUWERS: Additionally, neither of the cases cited by the State in support of Supplemental 3 have to do with defense of others.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to give defense of others because of *Gonzalez*, quite frankly. If I did give that instruction, I was going to delete Or others --

MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

THE COURT: -- because of the *Gonzalez* decision. But I'm just looking at Instruction Number 2: An arrestee may physically resist arrest only if the peace officer or private person making the arrest uses force as unlawful and excessive, and only if the arrestee is facing imminent and seriously bodily injury at the hands of the peace officer or private person making the arrest.

After looking at the *Runyan* decision, what I am inclined to do, counsel, is give Instruction Number 2 as originally proposed by the State and not give Instruction Number 3. Because I think Instruction Number 2 would then cover Instruction Number 3.

MS. BROUWERS: Okay.

THE COURT: So, counsel, as to State's Supplemental Instruction Number 2, I will give it as initially proposed. I'm not going to give Instruction Number 3, because I believe it's covered

has occurred. And in the event that there are two different interpretations of evidence that can be made by the jury, that they are to adopt the one that will -- that tend -- that will tend towards his innocence and reject the one that points to guilt. And that's also consistent with the State having the burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt in this case.

THE COURT: State, your argument in opposition.

MR. DICKERSON: Argument in opposition is that just like Defense counsel ended her argument with -- consistent with the State having the burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, *Vales v State* [phonetic], which is cited here as support for this, is actually saying just the same thing, that as long as the jury is properly instructed on the standard of beyond a reasonable doubt, which we know it is, especially in light of the fact that it's given statutory instruction and the *Crawford* instructions that Defense counsel's proffered, then this particular instruction is, in fact, incorrect and confusing.

THE COURT: I'm not going to give the Defendant's Proposed Instruction Number 2.

Counsel, it's after 11:00. I'm going to have the -- I'm going to advise the jury that they can take a lunch break and be back at 1:00.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

MS. BROUWERS: Okay.

THE COURT: If you could advise the jury that they can

1	take their lunch break now and just be back by 1:00. Thank you,
2	counsel.
3	MS. BROUWERS: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: On Defendant's Proposed Instruction
5	Number 3, the crime of battery with use of a deadly weapon
6	resulting in substantial bodily harm
7	MR. DICKERSON: The State objects to this, Your Honor,
8	as being confusing and duplicative of what's covered by the proper
9	instructions of battery and battery/deadly weapon resulting in
10	substantial bodily harm.
11	THE COURT: Defense, what's your position on this?
12	MS. BROUWERS: Our position is that it's appropriate,
13	because it demonstrates to the jury that they have to meet each one
14	of those elements in order to find him guilty of that particular
15	offense.
16	THE COURT: And I think the State also objected, if I recall,
17	of the word Improperly.
18	MR. DICKERSON: That's correct, we did.
19	THE COURT: I'm not going to give this instruction. I
20	believe it's sufficiently covered by other instructions.
21	Battery State's Defense Defendant's Proposed
22	Instruction Number 4, battery means willful.
23	MS. BROUWERS: 4 and just for housekeeping
24	purposes 4 and 5, Defense Proposed 4 and 5, I think we can
25	withdraw, because I agree that they've been covered by the ones
	1

that Your Honor has indicated you're inclined to give from the State's packet.

THE COURT: So as to Defendant's Proposed Instructions
Number 4 and 5, you're withdrawing them?

MS. BROUWERS: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

As to Defendant's Proposed Instruction Number 6: In order to find that a deadly weapon was used.

MR. DICKERSON: We object to that, Your Honor. It's not proper statement. I think that would be use of a deadly weapon in furtherance of a felony, like robbery. Here, it's the use of a deadly weapon in the actual commission of the battery.

MS. BROUWERS: Your Honor, I do believe it's appropriate. They've -- in the State's packet, they've defined what a deadly weapon is. But they didn't define what it means to use a deadly weapon. And so a deadly -- the jury also needs to be able to find that the weapon was used, not that it was merely present or that it, you know, there needs to be a finding that a deadly weapon was actually used beyond just defining what a deadly weapon is.

MR. DICKERSON: And that's why they've been instructed on all lesser includeds, and the definition of a deadly weapon and the definition of battery with use of a deadly weapon.

THE COURT: Counsel, I reviewed the *Boschauer versus*State [phonetic], and *Brooks versus State* decision. Could you point out to me where in those decisions you derive this instruction?

MS. BROUWERS: To be frank, I don't have that case law directly in front of. But both of those stand for the proposition that the mere presence of a weapon doesn't mean that the weapon was being used.

THE COURT: And I believe in the *Brooks* decision, it also talked about knowledge. And it talked about aiding and abetting, things of that nature.

MS. BROUWERS: Correct.

THE COURT: I'm not going to give it, based on this authorities you've cited to me.

MS. BROUWERS: And then to speed things up a little bit, the Defense Proposed 7, 8, 9 -- 7, 8, and 9 can be withdrawn, because we've agreed on the language from *Runyan* that's been included in the State's --

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

And then State's proposed -- shucks.

Defendant's Proposed Instruction Number 10: Lawful resistance to the commission of a public offense.

MR. DICKERSON: We would just object to this, given that the second portion is now covered in the instructions that we have, and the lawful resistance to commission of a public offense doesn't necessarily apply to the defendant in this case. I think it would apply to the two victims. So that's why we object with the caveat that if it is given, we do request that the entire statutory language be given, that being the inclusion of and by other parties to both

9

22

23

24 25 line 3 and line 4.

THE COURT: I actually pulled the legislative history on this statute. There's not a whole lot there, quite frankly, because I think -- I'm not quite clear on the State's position. This does appear -- are you objecting to the second paragraph, counsel? Mr. Dickerson?

MR. DICKERSON: The second paragraph I believe is covered by our proportionality instruction that's been agreed upon by the parties. But that's all we submit on that.

MS. BROUWERS: As to -- as far as paragraph 2 goes, I don't have any problem with striking paragraph 2.

THE COURT: With what, counsel?

MS. BROUWERS: I don't have any problem with striking paragraph 2.

THE COURT: Okay. What about the State's position that the entire statute be included? I'm inclined to give the instruction. My -- but the State is requesting that I cite the entire statute. What's your position on that?

The entire statute reads:

Lawful resistance to the commission of public offense may be made:

- 1. By the party about to be injured.
- 2. By other parties.

They want me to -- I assume you want to read on the second sentence, counsel?

1	Resistance sufficient to prevent the offense may be made
2	by the person about to be injured and/or by other persons.
3	To keep it consistent, the statute actually uses the word
4	parties. Do you have any objection to adding
5	MS. BROUWERS: No, I'll submit that.
6	THE COURT: I'm sorry, counsel?
7	MS. BROUWERS: I said I'll submit it
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	MS. BROUWERS: to Your Honor's discretion.
10	THE COURT: So this will be given as modified.
11	Paragraph 2 will be deleted.
12	The second sentence will read:
13	The resistance sufficient to prevent the offense may be
14	made by the person about to be injured.
15	Should we put an Or there? Or
16	MS. BROUWERS: Yeah, I think that's
17	THE COURT: by other persons?
18	MR. DICKERSON: And/or. Because both people would
19	still have the right.
20	MS. BROUWERS: That's fine. And/or is fine.
21	THE COURT: And/or by other persons.
22	And with that modification, it'll be given.
23	MS. BROUWERS: And then we can, I think, skip ahead
24	also. So 11, 12 okay. 11 and 12 can be withdrawn because we've
25	covered those and the ones based over on <i>Runvan</i> that were

agreed to between the parties, so 11 and 12 we can skip.

And then with respect to 13, we can withdraw that one, because it's been covered -- it's being covered, rather, by the ones in the Defense supplemental proposed, which I know we'll get to after.

THE COURT: And then as to 14, I intend to give that. You're requesting that instruction?

MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. That's constitutional right in a criminal case.

MR. DICKERSON: No objection.

THE COURT: 14 will be given.

MS. BROUWERS: And then with respect to the one in our original packet, Number 15, I've prepared a modified one based upon our discussions with Your Honor yesterday, and that's included in the supplemental proposed by the Defense.

THE COURT: Okay. And so you're withdrawing this one as --

MS. BROUWERS: Well, I -- I'll -- I want to make a record on it just briefly. So --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. BROUWERS: -- the only changes that have been made between this original proposed one and then the modified one is I agree to strike the word Material in the first sentence, with I think is appropriate.

15

17

18

22

23

24 25

But the second change is, in the original, the instruction says: The defendant does not have to prove his innocence.

And then it says: Accordingly, the defendant does not have to call witnesses or testify on his behalf.

I believe that the sentence: Defendant does not have to prove his innocence is appropriate, because it doesn't -- there -- it prevents them from trying to shift the burden or prevents the jury from thinking that he has any kind of burden to prove innocence. And so that's why I think my original, with the -- my original proposed instruction with taking out the word Material is appropriate. But based upon our discussions about that with Your Honor yesterday, I proposed a modified one that's concluded in the State's -- I'm sorry, in the Defense supplemental. But it would be my request to have the original.

THE COURT: And, counsel, just for the record, the modified one is contained in Defendant's Supplemental Proposed Instructions and it's Instruction Number 5.

MS. BROUWERS: That's correct.

THE COURT: Counsel for the State, I gave you a piece of paper; do you have that piece of paper?

MR. DICKERSON: That's correct. I do have that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Can you approach and provide me with that piece of paper.

MR. DICKERSON: Yes.

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

And as to -- since you submitted a modified one, is it your position that if I don't give the initial one, which was Defendant's Proposed Instruction Number 15, that I give the modified one, which is Defendant's Supplemental Instruction Number 5?

MS. BROUWERS: Correct. But it was my understanding that Your Honor had a further modification that --

THE COURT: That's true. But --

MS. BROUWERS: -- because it comes from case law.

THE COURT: -- I'm allowing you to make your record.

MS. BROUWERS: That would be my request, but I -- I'll submit it to Your Honor's discretion as far as the modified length -as far as the further modification Your Honor's about to read.

THE COURT: Okay. And State, what -- my modification that I had proposed was I was not going to give the Defendant's Proposed Instruction Number 15 or Defendant's Supplemental Instruction Number 5. But I was going to modify those. I wasn't going to give them as submitted, but I was going to modify them and I was going to have a jury instruction that basically stated: The defendant does not have to testify or present any evidence to prove innocence. The State has the burden of proving every element of the charges beyond a reasonable doubt. And I was going to have that as a separate instruction.

MR. DICKERSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What's the State's position?

MR. DICKERSON: State's position is that we objected to the original Defense Instruction 15 and the Supplemental Instruction 5. Given that the first two sentences were duplicative and covered fully by the reasonable doubt instruction in State's instructions on what are -- we're calling the stock instructions, Number 5.

And as to the next two sentences as modified by Your Honor, with that jury instruction, I believe, 3.2 out of the Ninth Circuit, the State does not object to that.

THE COURT: Okay. I am not -- I am going to ask the
Defense Proposed Instruction Number 15 and Defendant's
Proposed Supplemental Instruction Number 5, I'm going to give them as modified.

And the modification will be: The defendant does not have to testify or present any evidence to prove innocence. The State has the burden of proving every element of the charges beyond a reasonable doubt.

And it'll -- in all likelihood, we haven't decided yet what order, but that will go after the reasonable doubt instruction. It'll be a freestanding instruction.

State, if you could approach. Thank you.

MR. DICKERSON: Thanks.

MS. BROUWERS: And then the original -- and then

Defense originally proposed 16, 17, can be withdrawn. That was
with respect to an expert, which was not -- we didn't have an expert

1	testify. And also, the instruction concerning the defendant having
2	been in custody, that evidence was not adduced at trial or
3	introduced at trial, rather. And so we'll withdraw those two.
4	THE COURT: Both of those instructions will be
5	withdrawn.
6	And then as to the defendant's verdict form
7	MS. BROUWERS: And I think I made my record on this
8	earlier, but
9	THE COURT: Right. And I'm just addressing it.
10	MS. BROUWERS: Okay. Perfect.
11	THE COURT: So this verdict form attached to your
12	March 23 Proposed Jury Instructions will not be given.
13	MS. BROUWERS: Okay.
14	THE COURT: And then as to Defendant's Supplemental
15	Proposed Jury Instructions, Instructions Number 1, 2 will be given.
16	Instruction Number 3 will be given as modified. And I believe the
17	modification was you're going to as to the word, Not guilty, it
18	won't be in caps capital it won't be capital the first letter will
19	not be capitalized and it won't be in quotes.
20	MR. DICKERSON: Yes, that is correct. For
21	MS. BROUWERS: And that applies to 1, 2, and 3, correct?
22	MR. DICKERSON: That's what the State would request.
23	THE COURT: Actually, yeah. It's Instructions Number 2,
24	Defendant's Supplemental Instructions Number 2, 3, and 4 will be
25	given, but modified. The words, Not guilty, the first letter in each of
	43

1	those words will not be capitalized and they will not be put in
2	quotes.
3	MS. BROUWERS: Your Honor, with respect to Number 4,
4	it was my understanding before that the parties were in agreement.
5	But only with respect to Number 4 that the not guilty being in
6	quotations is appropriate.
7	THE COURT: Then that'll
8	MR. DICKERSON: State's fine with that.
9	THE COURT: Then that'll be the order. That'll be given as
10	written.
11	MS. BROUWERS: Okay.
12	THE COURT: And then we've already done Instruction
13	Number 5 will be given as modified, and then the verdict form will
14	be this verdict form submitted by the defendant will not be given.
15	It'll be given as previously discussed.
16	MS. BROUWERS: Okay.
17	THE COURT: Is that all the jury instructions, counsel?
18	MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor.
19	MR. DICKERSON: That is.
20	THE COURT: Okay. At this point, what I'd like to do is
21	have all modifications prepared without citations, leave the number
22	blank. It'll say, Instruction Number. And then we're we'll
23	reconvene at 12:30, and then we'll go as to the order we want to
24	give them.
25	MR. DICKERSON: Okay.

1	THE COURT: If you have a suggestion as to the order, I					
2	am amenable to that.					
3	MR. DICKERSON: Okay.					
4	MS. BROUWERS: I think we probably I anticipate we're					
5	going to be able to agree on the order.					
6	MS. DERJAVINA: Yeah, and that's					
7	THE COURT: Okay. So how about we reconvene					
8	at 12:45?					
9	MS. BROUWERS: Yes.					
10	MR. DICKERSON: Sounds great, Your Honor.					
11	THE COURT: Okay. And so and at that point, that will					
12	be I will number them and that'll be the jury instructions.					
13	And, counsel, please confer prior to submitting to them					
14	and make sure it's what we have					
15	MS. BROUWERS: Correct.					
16	THE COURT: what has been ordered by the Court.					
17	So we'll be in recess till 12:45.					
18	MS. BROUWERS: Thank you.					
19	MS. DERJAVINA: Thank you.					
20	MR. DICKERSON: Thank you, Your Honor.					
21	THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.					
22	Oh, I apologize. Did is that all the instructions that					
23	either counsel wanted to submit?					
24	MS. BROUWERS: Yes.					
25	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes.					

1	MR. DICKERSON: That is.			
2	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.			
3	[Court recessed at 11:21 a.m., until 12:55 p.m.]			
4	[Outside the presence of the jury.]			
5	THE COURT: Let the record reflect the presence of			
6	counsel for the State, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant.			
7	The jury instructions have been settled. I've been			
8	provided with a copy of the instructions to the jury.			
9	Counsel, has each counsel had an opportunity to review			
10	the instructions prior to them being submitted to me this			
11	afternoon?			
12	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.			
13	MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor.			
14	THE COURT: And all parties are in agreement as to the			
15	instructions; is that correct?			
16	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.			
17	MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor.			
18	THE COURT: And also as to the order the instructions are			
19	to be given?			
20	MS. DERJAVINA: That is correct.			
21	MS. BROUWERS: Correct.			
22	THE COURT: Does counsel have copies?			
23	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.			
24	THE COURT: Okay. So Instruction Number 1 will be: It is			
25	now my duty as judge.			

1	Instruction Number 2 will be: If, in these instructions.					
2	Instruction Number 3 will be: And information is but a					
3	formal method.					
4	Instruction Number 4 will be: To constitute the crime.					
5	Instruction Number 5 will be: The defendant is presumed.					
6	Instruction Number 6: The defendant does not have to					
7	testify.					
8	Instruction Number 7: You are here to determine.					
9	Instruction Number 8: The evidence which you are to					
10	consider.					
11	Instruction Number 9: The credibility or believability of a					
12	witness.					
13	Instruction Number 10: Battery means willful and					
14	unlawful.					
15	Instruction 11: If you find the defendant is guilty of					
16	battery.					
17	Instruction Number 12: If you find the defendant is guilty					
18	of battery regardless of whether.					
19	Instruction Number 13: If the State fails to prove beyond a					
20	reasonable doubt.					
21	Instruction Number 14: If the State fails beyond a					
22	reasonable doubt the defendant committed each and every					
23	element.					
24	Instruction Number 15: If the State proves beyond a					
25	reasonable doubt.					

1	Instruction 16: If the State proves beyond a reasonable					
2	doubt.					
3	Instruction 17: An owner or occupant of land.					
4	Instruction 18: An arrest is the taking of a person into					
5	custody.					
6	Instruction 19: An arrestee may physically resist.					
7	Number 20: Lawful resistance of the commission of a					
8	public offense.					
9	Number 21: The use of force in self-defense.					
10	Instruction Number 22: Fear of death or great bodily					
11	injury.					
12	Instruction Number 23: Self-defense is not available.					
13	Instruction Number 24: If evidence of self-defense is					
14	present.					
15	Instruction Number 25: A person may use force or I'm					
16	sorry a person may use force in defense.					
17	Instruction Number 26: The right of self-defense exists.					
18	Instruction Number 27: The law does not justify.					
19	Instruction Number 28: It is a constitutional right.					
20	Instruction Number 29: A portion of the video/audio.					
21	Instruction Number 30: Although you are to consider.					
22	Instruction Number 31: In your deliberation.					
23	Instruction Number 32: During the course of this trial.					
24	Instruction Number 33: When you retire.					
25	Instruction Number 34: If, during your deliberation.					
1						

1	And Instruction Number 35: Now you will listen to the					
2	arguments.					
3	Are those all the instructions, counsel?					
4	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.					
5	THE COURT: And then the verdict form that will go back,					
6	it's been submitted attached to the back of the jury instructions,					
7	correct?					
8	MS. DERJAVINA: Correct.					
9	MS. BROUWERS: Correct.					
10	THE COURT: And both parties have had an opportunity to					
11	review it?					
12	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes.					
13	THE COURT: Thank you.					
14	Counsel, I'm just going to take a two-minute recess. I'll be					
15	right back.					
16	MS. DERJAVINA: Okay.					
17	MS. BROUWERS: Uh-huh.					
18	[Off the record at 1:01 p.m., until 1:03 p.m.]					
19	[Outside the presence of the jury.]					
20	THE COURT: I'm having the marshal check to see if all the					
21	jurors are present. If they are, I'm going to have them enter the					
22	courtroom.					
23	[Pause in proceedings.]					
24	THE COURT: If for any reason somebody cannot hear me,					
25	please raise your hand, make sure all parties can hear me.					

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

24

25

г	$\overline{}$			
ш	\mathbf{D}	ın	nracaaa	linac
ш	rause	111	proceed	แแนร.
L			p	

[Jury reconvened at 1:05 p.m.]

THE COURT: Let the record reflect the presence of counsel for the State, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant.

Do the parties stipulate to the presence of the jury?

MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.

MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I'm about to instruct you upon the law as it applies in this case. I would like to instruct you orally, without reading to you. However, these instructions are of such importance that it is necessary for me to read to you these carefully prepared written instructions. The instructions are long and some are quite complicated. If they are not especially clear when I read them to you, please keep in mind that when you go back to the jury room, you will be able to take these carefully prepared written instructions with you so that you can read them and consider them carefully.

[Jury instructions read.]

THE COURT: State, are you prepared to go forward with closing argument?

MR. DICKERSON: We are, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you.

///

50

CLOSING ARGUMENT FOR THE STATE

MR. DICKERSON: Ladies and gentlemen, what kind of man stabs two security guards on the Las Vegas Strip just for asking him to leave? Well, the same man that later tells police, I tore they asses up, two bitches. That's Toyer Edwards, sitting right there.

Toyer Edwards, on June 18th, 2017, used totally unjustified deadly force against two security guards. There was no basis for his actions and there's no justification here today. That's why Toyer Edwards is guilty of the crimes in the charge.

Now, you've heard the evidence and you've listened to the reading of the instructions. These instructions are going to lead you through your deliberations and act as a guide as to how you weigh the evidence in this case. In there, it talks about the evidence, in particular, and what evidence you've heard, specifically, evidence of direct and circumstantial nature. Direct evidence being that which a witness has testified to, and circumstantial evidence being things that are proven by other facts.

Well, you've heard both, you were to consider both. Think about what you've heard and who you heard it from, and those facts that are actually in evidence. Because you're also instructed that you must not speculate to be true any insinuation suggested by any questions. And, really, you can't just speculate to anything. You can make reasonable inferences based on the evidence, but speculation doesn't apply here.

So what do we know? Well, the Defense charge of the crime of battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm. This is three general parts to this crime: The battery, the use of the deadly weapon, and the resulting in substantial bodily harm.

First we'll take a look at the battery, which is in your instructions. The battery means any willful or unlawful use of force or violence upon the person of another.

Now, I must note that a battery can be any slight touching by the defendant upon the person of another, as long as the touching was intentional and unwanted. It's also worth noting that a battery, it need not be violent or severe and it need not cause bodily pain or bodily harm. That's a battery. Just a basic battery. A push is a battery. And that's the first part of the crime charged here. No doubt battery occurred. The touching was unlawful, it was willful, and it was, no doubt, unwanted.

But this was more than just a mere nonviolent or nonsevere battery that didn't cause pain or harm. This battery did cause pain, it did cause harm. And that's because it was caused with a deadly weapon. Now, you're instructed that you'd consider that the battery -- you find guilty of battery and then move onto whether it was committed with a deadly weapon.

Deadly weapon's defined for you in one of two ways, you can consider both:

Any instrument which, if used in the ordinary manner

contemplated by its design and construction will or is likely to cause substantial bodily harm or death.

Alternatively or in addition to any weapon, device, instrument, material, or substance, which, under the circumstances of which it's used, attempted to be used, or threatened to be used, is readily capable of causing substantial bodily harm or death.

What do we have, ladies and gentlemen? We have a knife. Probably one of the oldest weapons in human history. The knife. No doubt at deadly weapon under both of those two standards. It is an instrument which, if used in its ordinary contemplated manner, a knife ordinarily contemplated for several things, including defense, also cutting a steak. But, regardless, to cut flesh.

Or any weapon, device, instrument under the circumstances in which it's used, attempted to be used, or threatened to be used, is readily capable of causing substantial bodily harm or death.

Now, we heard the defendant's words when he was out there talking to William Allison and Chase Lovato. He told them, I'll stitch you up, I'll kill you. I got mines; indicating that, yeah, he is threatening to use this weapon to cause death or substantial bodily harm. And it is absolutely capable of doing that, as we saw by the ultimate injuries inflicted and, luckily, nothing further beyond that.

And, ultimately, his own words to police officers, yelling in the back room of that security office, indicating that he could

have done worse and he should have done worse.

Now, we know the battery occurred. But just to refresh everybody's memory on it, William Allison, stabbed in the side, who's also stabbed in the shoulder. Couldn't see the defendant using that knife, coming in right into his side. Chase Lovato, ultimately coming to the assistance of William Allison, is stabbed in the back of leg when he's doing that. You can see the knife going into his leg there in the bottom section. That's a battery with the knife being a deadly weapon. So we have battery with use of a deadly weapon.

Now, onto the substantial bodily harm portion of this crime. So we have the battery, we have the deadly weapon.

What's a substantial bodily harm? You might be thinking that, well, they have all their fingers, toes, their arms, everything. They're able to walk in here. Couldn't be substantial bodily harm, could it?

Well, remember, a typical battery doesn't need to cause pain, it doesn't need to cause harm. It can be a push. That's why we have the addition of substantial bodily harm.

Substantial bodily harm includes prolonged physical pain. So if the battery causes prolonged physical pain, not something that a slight push is going to do, though the push is a battery, it's not going to cause prolonged physical pain. Here, stabbing somebody, well, you heard it did. It did cause prolonged physical pain.

It would help to know what prolonged means, right?

Prolonged physical pain, you're instructed, occurs when a victim experiences physical suffering or injury lasting longer than that of the immediate pain of the wrongful touching.

Lasting longer than the immediate pain of the wrongful touching. So you can think of a couple of things that would have immediate pain and then it would go away. Maybe a slap to the face, something like that. This pain lasted longer than that for both William Allison and Chase Lovato.

Here, Chase Lovato was stabbed in the back of the leg. He told you that the pain lasted several days. It hurt to put weight on the leg, we could see that, we could see him limping around in the back before he'd walk to the back. And he tells you that the bruise lasted for months and he was scarred.

The important thing here is the pain to his leg lasted for several days. That is far beyond that immediate period of the initial wrongful touching. That is substantial bodily harm. And the reason we have that is because battery covers a number of actions. And when you cause an injury like this, it's something different than just a slight push or a slap.

William Allison, stabbed twice. Once in the lower-back area, mid-back, and once in the shoulder. He told you that that shoulder injury, the pain lasted a month and a half and that it hurt to move his arm up above his shoulder, to the front and to the side, all of that hurt. Pressure -- any pressure to that injury hurt and he bled continuously and scarred.

 Again, this is far beyond pain of the immediate wrongful touching. This is lasting a month and a half. This is pain that rises to the level of prolonged physical pain being substantial bodily harm.

And then we look to his other injury. There, his back.

That pain, he told you, lasted three months. It hurt to turn, all the pressure hurt, and it bled continuously.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, that is pain rising to the level of being prolonged physical pain. That is substantial bodily harm.

So it's important to note, you're also instructed that the defendant, he does not need to intend to cause substantial bodily harm to be liable for actually causing substantial bodily harm. So you can think about other examples. If a person were to punch somebody in the face and maybe fracture their nose or cause a slice to their eyelid, where it takes a really long time to heal, it's going to hurt, not going to be able to see. That's going to be an issue. That's going to be substantial bodily harm.

The deciding factor here is prolonged physical pain. You heard about these individuals, prolonged physical pain. The pain here is rising to the level of substantial bodily harm. Make no doubt about it.

So we have both these individuals, Chase Lovato and William Allison have had batteries with deadly weapons resulting in substantial bodily harms committed upon them by the defendant.

 It's undisputed that the defendant did that.

Now, I think the question that comes up is, Well, were they justified in what they did? It's obviously what's in the back of your mind and I'll tell you, yeah, they work.

There's two different avenues here. Were there justification? They're justified under both. The first is self-defense and defense of others. They are just as justified as anybody else in the world using self-defense and defense of others. This is something that we'll talk about, you're instructed heavily on it, as you could hear when you heard the instructions.

The other avenue is a citizen's arrest. Now, you also will go through the instructions here, but a citizen's arrest changes the dynamic. Any arrest, for that instance, changes the dynamic of who can use force and how they can use force, and in what situation. Both of these two avenues are open and available only to the victims in this case, William Allison and Chase Lovato.

First, self-defense, defense of others. Keep in mind when we go through these instructions that a person may use force in defense of others to the same extent that a person could use force to protect themself in self-defense.

So two different ways of self-defense being, one, there is an actual imminent threat; or two, what we'll get to right here, next, is an apparent threat. The actual imminent threat is a person -- the use of force in self-defense is justified and not unlawful when the person who uses such force actually and reasonably believes that

there is imminent danger that the assailant will cause him great bodily injury. And that it's absolutely necessary under the circumstances for him to use, in self-defense, force for the purpose of avoiding great bodily injury to himself.

Now, remember the instruction right before this:

Self-defense applies just the same as defense of others. So you can use that same force to protect others if you perceive that same threat.

The next avenue of self-defense is the apparent threat.

Actual danger is not necessary to justify the use of force in self-defense. A person has the right to defend from an apparent danger to the same extent as he would from an actual danger.

That being justified only under these three prongs, if they're all met. That he's confronted with the appearance of an imminent danger which arouses in his mind an honest belief and fear that he is about to suffer great bodily injury. Again, applies to defense of others as well. He or someone else is about to suffer great bodily injury.

He acts solely upon the appearances and his fear in that actual belief. It's important to remember that, ladies and gentlemen. Solely acting upon that appearance and that fear. That's not acting in retaliation and anger, that's not acting in anything except that apparent threat and your fear of that attack, that imminent danger.

And then a reasonable person in a similar situation would

 believe himself to be in like danger. A reasonable person. Ladies and gentlemen, you were all chosen for this jury for a reason: Because you are the reasonable people. You are here to determine what the reasonable person would perceive, what the reasonable person in a similar situation would believe. That's why we worked so tirelessly for two days to have you here as a fair and impartial jury.

Now, you take a look at those two different avenues, the imminent danger and the apparent threat of an imminent danger, and you realize what are we looking at? We're looking at Chase Lovato using pepper spray on Toyer Edwards. At that point in time is when the self-defense, defense of others actually occurs. It's after several -- a long period of time that the defendant has, at that point in time, had his hand in his pocket, shaking that knife.

Obviously, to both of them, William Allison knowing there's something there, Chase Lovato, knowing it's a knife.

At this point in time, Toyer Edwards has stood up, he's taking a bladed stance, focusing on who he's been focusing most of his energy on the entire time, William Allison. Chase Lovato, as you saw in the video over and over and over again, he's -- right before he does this, he's staring at that pocket, realizing that this threat is imminent, this is going to happen.

You actually heard it from William Allison too, who was perceiving it from the front, not even knowing what, in fact, it was, just knowing there was a weapon in there. And he told you that he

believed the threat was imminent and that, if he were to turn his back to Toyer Edwards, that imminent threat was going to reveal itself right in his back.

So what is done? Chase Lovato, he actually and reasonably believed in that threat. Remember? He told you he actual believed it, that's established. What would the reasonable person believe? The reasonable person who's been standing there looking at Toyer Edward with what they know to be a knife in the pocket, holding it, ready to go, getting more angry and more angry, more explicit in his threats second after second after second, as he's refusing all of their demands, the easiest one being just leave.

Toyer Edwards then stands up and takes that bladed position. It's that point in time when that appearance of the imminent danger is ever-present. There's no doubt that that right there is the appearance of imminent danger. So acting solely upon the fear and actual belief, what does he do? He sprays him with pepper spray.

Chase Lovato was acting in self-defense and, really, the defense of William Allison when he sprayed Toyer Edwards with pepper spray. It was justified. That's the bottom line.

But what's important is that we look to the citizen's arrest.

I told you that it changes things. And it does, no doubt. An owner or occupant of land or building -- or a building may make an oral or a written demand of a person to vacate the property. Any person who then thereafter, having been given such a demand, remains on

the land or the building is trespassing.

So we are, William Allison, Chase Lovato, they work for the security company, representing the owners and occupants of this property, they can make a demand of someone to leave. And that's exactly what they did here.

After giving Toyer Edwards some time maybe to move by himself, maybe just to wake up and walk down Las Vegas Boulevard, they come and they talk to him. And, well, we saw how that played out.

They walked up early on in the shift, their coffees in their hands, just, Hey, Hey, sir. They wake him up, they ask him to leave. Simple, ladies and gentlemen. They have the right to do that, it's a very simple demand. All Toyer Edwards had to do was just leave, which he, at that point in time, is legally required to do, or he's trespassing.

After numerous demands, you heard demand after demand after demand to leave, and warned the defendant that he was trespassing and that he was going to be arrested if he didn't leave. That's what William Allison's doing right there is reading a trespass warning.

At that point in time, Chase Lovato is pulling out his handcuffs, realizing that there's an arrest that's about to go down. They're going to have to citizen's arrest a guy for just refusing to leave the property after a simple request.

The defendant, he's grabbing his knife. Look where that

hand is. It's right there in his pocket, ever present. Again, grabbing that knife, he refuses to leave.

Defendant says, You ain't going to do shit. I'll stitch you up.

I don't know how much more explicit the refusal to leave can be, but this isn't just a refusal to leave now. This is an overt threat to use deadly force upon these two young security guards.

So, as we look at that, trespassing, any person who, after being given such a demand, remains upon the land or in the building is trespassing. Toyer Edwards was trespassing. That's the bottom line.

Now, an arrest, it isn't just reserved for police officers.

Under the law, an arrest is the taking of a person into custody in a case and in the manner authorized by law. An arrest may be made by a peace officer or by a private person, one or the other.

Now, a private person may make an arrest or an attempt to commit a public offense that occurs in that person's presence. Trespassing, that's a public offense. Here, the defendant was trespassing in their presence. At that point in time, they have the right to make the citizen's arrest or trespass him.

Now, the next line in this instructions is incredibly important, that a private person, when arresting another, may use force that is necessary and reasonable to secure the arrest under the circumstances. Necessary and reasonable under the circumstances.

I say that all the force that was used here by Chase and William was reasonable and, no doubt, necessary to avoid much greater harm under these deadly circumstances.

So what do we see? What do we see -- the force that's -- initial force being pepper spray. Pepper spray, when faced with a deadly weapon, a deadly situation, a situation where someone could have died, William Lovato believed that he could have died. The defendant told him as much. And what do they use? Pepper spray. They bring pepper spray to a knife fight.

The weapons totally different here. The advantage, far be it, it's with the defendant. Pepper spray, more than reasonable. Probably, you know, not even where it should be. It's slow, that's all they had. That's all they carry, that's all they can do. So they use it.

Is it necessary? Yes, it's necessary. That attack was imminent. You heard from them. You see the situation. You see the defendant's demeanor. They, at this point in time, have the right to effectuate this arrest. And they have the right to use the force that's reasonable and necessary to effect that arrest, to take the defendant into custody.

This isn't a situation where they're just -- they stand there and the defendant can do whatever he wants; at this point in time, he's going in handcuffs. He's getting arrested and the police are going to get called. That's it.

Well, because he's resisting in the manner that he is,

clearly having a knife in his pocket, they can use any force that is reasonable and necessary under the circumstances. This force, pepper spray, reasonable and necessary. Probably should have used more.

The defendant did not have the right to resist a lawful arrest. It's incredibly important, ladies and gentlemen, once the arrest is happening, the arrestee may physically resist the arrest only if the peace officer or private person making the arrest uses force that is unlawful and excessive, and only if the arrestee is facing imminent and serious bodily harm at the hands of the peace officer or private person making the arrest. That's not available to the defendant.

It's not available to Toyer Edwards. He cannot use force to resist these two security officers. Not the force that was used, not any force, because what they were using was lawful force. The first thing to use force for the arrest, it would have to be that there's unlawful force. The force that these two security officers are using is lawful.

And it's not excessive. It's absolutely not excessive to the circumstances that he's facing -- that they're facing right there, a man with a knife. And they're sitting there with a can of peppers [sic].

And then the arrestee, more than that, needs to be facing imminent and serious bodily harm. So it's not just an idea of -- that, Oh, these guys could hurt me. He needs to be facing

imminent -- it's imminent and serious bodily harm. There's no evidence that he was facing any of that.

He could not resist these two officers arresting him. What he could have done is just listen to commands and never gotten arrested for trespassing. But he didn't do that. He forced the issue and he put himself in the situation. He caused the situation where he could use or decided to use deadly force on these two men.

Chase Lovato and William Allison had the right to self-defense, defense of others, and all reasonable and necessary force that a citizen can use during an arrest. They were justified, that's the bottom line.

The defendant, well, he wasn't. He committed a battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm. He tore they asses up. That's the clearest evidence of how he was feeling that day.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the verdict form, this is what you're going to see when you go back for your deliberations.

There's several options on there, we've gone through them all.

We've gone through the definition of battery, battery with use of a deadly weapon, battery resulting in substantial bodily harm. And there's only one option for both counts. The only correct option is battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm based upon what the evidence shows.

For that reason, ladies and gentlemen, we ask you to find the defendant guilty of both counts.

1	THE COURT: Defense, are you prepared to go forward
2	with your closing argument?
3	MS. ODEH: Yes, Your Honor. If we can switch to my
4	computer?
5	[Pause in proceedings.]
6	CLOSING ARGUMENT FOR THE DEFENDANT
7	MS. ODEH: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	Okay. So it's a Sunday morning in June and Mr. Edwards
9	isn't bothering anybody. He's walking into the Hawaiian
10	Marketplace alone, causing no trouble at all. He finds a quiet
11	corner, and there's nobody there. And he's going to take a little
12	nap. He takes his shoes off, puts his sunglasses on, and he's just
13	laying down, relaxing. Again, not bothering anyone. He's not
14	pushing a shopping cart filled with garbage. He's not curled up
15	under the table like some vagrant. He's just sitting there.
16	And here come our security guards. They are not having
17	it. They're on their way to tell him to get out. Apparently, there is a
18	no sleeping rule at the Hawaiian Marketplace. But the funny thing
19	is, it's not in the policy manual, because
20	MR. DICKERSON: Objection.
21	MS. DERJAVINA: Objection, Your Honor.
22	MR. DICKERSON: Facts not in evidence.
23	THE COURT: Counsel approach.
24	[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]
25	MS. DERJAVINA: There's no evidence that there's a

that the sleeping policy is not in the manual. There's no questions
about whether that policy was in the manual.
MS. ODEH: My recollection of the testimony was that
there was a manual and they didn't know if there was any rules
about sleeping in it.
MS. DERJAVINA: There wasn't
MS. ODEH: They could
MS. DERJAVINA: testimony like that, but much less, I'm
saying they don't know whether it's there is much different than
saying there is nothing in the policy.
THE COURT: Arguably, they did not know of any policy
sleeping policy, before they approached.
MS. DERJAVINA: I don't think that was
THE COURT: They were unaware is that my
recollection was
MS. DERJAVINA: They asked about the deescalation
policy, but
THE COURT: I understand, counsel.
MS. ODEH: My recollection is I asked Allison if there was
a written rule about no sleeping, and he said he didn't think there
was.
THE COURT: Okay. You can argue that.
MS. ODEH: Okay.
THE COURT: It's argument, counsel.
MS. DERJAVINA: It's fine. We're just

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

[End of bench conference.]

MS. ODEH: So Mr. Allison was testifying. I asked him if there was a written rule about no sleeping at the Hawaiian Marketplace. And he said he didn't think there was. In fact, he said that he didn't even know about a manual.

It seemed that the policy of these security guards was they just make up the rules as they go along and then they decide on their own how to enforce them. They get some handcuffs, they get some pepper spray, and they just go out there and they figure out how they're going to enforce the rules that they create.

So they come up upon Toyer Edwards and they tell him to wake up. If you recall, the entire incident took less than three minutes from start to finish. So they come up to him, tell him to wake up, don't give him much time. He's not waking up fast enough, he's too slow.

And then he has the nerve to disrespect them and not get up and walk away right away. Did he talk back? Probably. He probably did. They were harassing him for no reason. He didn't feel like it was justified.

And he told them, Call Metro. And the reason he did that is clear: They were acting outside their authority. And even Mr. Edwards knew the right thing to do is call Metro. Did they call Metro? Nope, they didn't. They decided that they're the police of the Hawaiian Marketplace. They don't need to call Metro. And then

they escalate the situation.

Now, why in the world would they have escalated the situation as fast as they did? I'm going to submit to you because they think they are the police of that area, and everyone needs to answer to them. After all, they sat -- both sat up here and said they were the green security shirt, that makes them in charge. They've got their handcuffs and they got their mace. And that's their jurisdiction. And they enforce the rules of their jurisdiction.

So what we see when they come up is immediately, the handcuffs come out and the mace come out before Mr. Edwards is even completely awake. Within seconds of them stepping up to him, we're going to see the handcuffs and the mace.

[Video played.]

MS. ODEH: These two guys are ready for a fight.

Mr. Edwards hasn't done anything except wake up.

You know, the State's trying to tell you that they're making a citizen's arrest. Which is interesting, because, first of all, I don't know what they're making a citizen's arrest for. For sleeping? Sleeping's not against the law. Remember, they just walked up on him and the handcuffs and mace are coming out to make an arrest.

So he's not -- sleeping is not breaking the law. They want you to believe that maybe it's trespassing. Here's the thing with these security guards claiming they're arresting him for trespassing. Mr. Lovato testified yesterday that it was his understanding that a person needed to be on property for 30

minutes before they could trespass him. And it's clear from the video that you saw over and over again that he was only there for 15 minutes. So from his own testimony, in Mr. Lovato's mind, there was no justification to make any sort of arrest for trespassing.

So this claim of citizen's arrest is something that's being told to you after the fact to try and justify what they do next to Mr. Edwards.

Now, let me say this: If for some reason you believe that they were justified in making a citizen's arrest of Toyer Edwards, he can resist that arrest if it's unlawful and excessive force is used. And he believes that's he's facing imminent serious bodily harm unless he resists. So even if you think somehow that they're justified, their force was so excessive that he's justified in resisting such an arrest.

Now, one of the other things that the State is talking to you about is how Mr. Allison, the security guard on the left there in the image, was reading Toyer Edwards a trespass notice. And that's not what I saw in the video. He took something out of his pocket and then put it back, and then took it out, and then put it back. I didn't see him reading anything to him.

Secondly, Mr. Lovato says that he can see the butt of knife sticking out of Mr. Edwards' pocket. What you're going to see -- what you saw in the video and what you'll see if you review the video again, is that Mr. Edwards' hand was buried deep in his pocket. You know, when we were doing jury selection, somebody

22

23

24 25 said, I hope there's video, I want to see the video. Because video doesn't lie. People can sit up here and they can forget what really happened, they can outright lit, that anything could happen.

But when you watch the video, the video doesn't lie. And when you watch this, you'll see Mr. Edwards' hand is deep in his pocket. He is clutching the knife, because he's probably scared. These two guys came up on him, handcuffs and mace are out for no reason, he doesn't know what's going to happen, and he's holding onto that knife. There's no way Mr. Lovato saw it.

Another thing I want you to look for is Mr. Lovato told you that he repeatedly told Toyer Edwards, You need to leave. He said he repeatedly told him, Take your hand out of your pocket. His mouth moves a little bit in the beginning, a little smile, and his mouth doesn't move again. So I don't know how he was saying these things, but he claims to have repeated and repeated. It just didn't happen and the video doesn't lie.

[Video played.]

MS. ODEH: Also, while Mr. Lovato was testifying, he indicated that he put his hand up on Mr. Allison and said, He's got a knife. He didn't say anything. He put his hand up. Seems to be he was saying, Hey, settle down, back off.

[Video played.]

MS. ODEH: Then Mr. Edwards stands up. He's going to leave. He doesn't want any trouble. And Mr. Lovato, again, didn't see that knife. He sprayed him with the mace for no reason.

Now, you heard Toyer Edwards as 58 years old, 5-foot-5, 125 pounds. Now he's sprayed with mace. And we got a 6-foot-2, 230-pound 22-year-old William Allison backing him into a corner. He's moving closer and closer, he's waving his arms and he's yelling.

So after Mr. Lovato sprays Mr. Edwards with the pepper spray, if you recall in the video, he sort of bends over, his eyes are burning, now Mr. Edwards pulls the knife out. Now he pulls it out. And you can see in the frozen image, it's behind his back.

Not two -- less than two minutes ago, he was sound asleep. He was woken up, his -- he's been sprayed with pepper spray, he's disoriented, his eyes are burning, he doesn't know what's going to happen and he still has the control to not go at anybody with that knife. He's got it behind his back. Sure, he's ready. Something's about to happen and he knows it. But he's not attacking anybody. He is absolutely in a defensive position.

You know, we talked about being prepared to defend yourself if something happens. That's exactly what he's doing right there.

Now, for what reason I don't know at this point,

Mr. Allison decides he needs to move in and take him down. I'm

going to ask you to remember that when Mr. Allison testified, he

admitted that, at the preliminary hearing, just one month after this,

he said he didn't know that Mr. Edwards had a weapon until he was

stabbed. So all that talk about he's going after him, to disarm him;

he didn't know he had a knife until after the fact. So that just doesn't hold up.

So I'm going to tell you, there can be no doubt that Mr. Edwards was facing imminent danger of bodily harm with Mr. Allison coming at him. It was necessary for him to use force to avoid injury to himself. That's self-defense, pure and simple.

In this still image, it's blurry, but you can see William Allison is clearly on top of him and the knife is just starting to come around. He didn't use any force until it was absolutely clear that he was in danger, he was starting to receive bodily harm. And then he defends himself. The video doesn't lie.

And if anyone had any doubt about how out of control these security guards were, after Lovato has him in a choke hold, William Allison decides to punch him in the head.

[Video played.]

MS. ODEH: And Mr. Edwards is left looking like this. A gash on the side of his head, eyes red and burning, and snot's running down his face from the mace.

When the State showed you this video of Mr. Edwards yelling. And I guess that this video of him getting all excited again, with snots coming out of his face, nobody helping him, this is supposed to confirm for you that he brutally stabbed two men half his age and twice his size.

[Video played.]

MS. ODEH: You know what I see here? I see a man

whose adrenalin is pumping. Minutes ago he was asleep, now he's sitting there bloody, maced, and in handcuffs.

And you can hear him in the video we watched yesterday saying, I can't calm down, I can't calm down. He couldn't calm down. And if you listen to the recording again, you're going to hear what he said. I heard things like, Look at that, I weigh 125 pounds, they wake me up in a stranglehold.

He's also trying to explain to someone, I said let me put my shoes on. You're a lying motherfucker. I was dead asleep out there in the chair. They come pushing me around. I know I got to go, but I ain't going nowhere till I put my shoes on. This bitch starts shaking up his pepper spray.

And then he says, They ain't hurt, their pride's hurt.

Those are the things that I heard him say.

Oh, you know what else I didn't hear him say in here? He said some offensive, inappropriate things. But he didn't call anybody a honky, which is what these guys sat up here and said. If that was true, you'd have heard that word in this 10-minute rant. I'm submitting to you they sat up here and made stuff up and filled in blanks after the fact to try and make him look like the bad guy.

And if you remember, when the paramedics came in and the police officer said, No, note him, go help them. The way Toyer Edwards was treated through this whole thing is disgraceful. And now he sits here charged with a crime.

So here's the charge. He's charged with two counts, one

against each of these security guards, battery with use of a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm. So the State has the burden to prove all three elements of that, a battery, use of a deadly weapon, and it resulted in substantial bodily harm. I'm going to quickly look at each of those.

So battery is a willful and unlawful use of force or violence upon the person of another. And they have unlawful there, underlined, because if the force you use is not unlawful, then it's not a battery. And you saw from the still images and from the video the only force Toyer Edwards used was in self-defense. And the use of force in self-defense is justified and it's not unlawful when the person who's using it, when Mr. Edwards is using it, he reasonably believes there's an imminent danger that the assailant is going to cause bodily harm to him, and that it's necessary under the circumstances for him to use, in self-defense, the force that's necessary -- the force or means that might cause bodily injury to the other person to avoid it to himself.

So he's using this -- any force he uses is in self-defense, so it's not unlawful. Under no circumstances did he commit willful and unlawful use of force. There just is not a battery on either one of these men.

So the use of a deadly weapon, and that is a weapon capable of causing substantial bodily harm or death. He had a kitchen knife in his pocket. We all saw it. It's a weapon that could cause bodily harm or death. I'll give you that. The State proved

that there was a deadly weapon involved in this case.

Now, let's talk about the resulting substantial bodily harm. It can be shown through any of these three, injury that creates a substantial risk of death. Neither of these guys testified that they had life-threatening injuries.

Number two, causes serious permanent disfigurement.

You know, they showed you -- the State showed you some pictures of scars that these two guys have. And your -- those are exhibits, so look at those. And look at how zoomed-in and close-up these -- they're distorted, they had to move in so close to be able to see these scars. That's not permanent disfigurement. A tiny scar that you have to zoom in so close you can't even make out the picture.

So I think what they're talking about is prolonged physical pain. So let's talk about prolonged physical pain. Both William Allison and Chase Lovato were treated in the emergency room that morning and they were released. You heard the only police officer that testified said he classified their injuries as minor. Now, they testified that they were in pain for months. William Allison couldn't move, he couldn't walk, he couldn't life his arms, he was bleeding profusely for three months. Come on, he didn't go to the doctor, he didn't get stitches. I'm going to tell you what he said is just not true, it doesn't hold up.

And here's another thing, they were treated by a doctor, maybe a couple of doctors. The State didn't bring any doctor in here to tell you, Oh, these were deep stab wounds, they were

life-threatening, permanent disfigurement, prolonged pain. You better believe if they could have proved that, they'd have put a doctor up there to tell you how horrible these injuries were. And the fact that they didn't do that, that's on them. They have the burden of proof. The State didn't bring that witness here. Ask yourselves why.

And while we're at it, any other holes that you see in the case, any questions you don't have answered, anytime you go, Well, wait, why? Well, what about this? That's on the State. It's their burden. They're the words who need to bring in every --

MS. DERJAVINA: Objection.

MS. ODEH: -- every witness to prove every element of their case. That doesn't count against the defendant. That's the State, in our position, not meeting their burden of proof.

So let's look at these injuries. They're basically cuts.

There's no profuse bleeding. They're held together with a little sticker. You saw these guys walk in here, they were fine. They walked -- William Allison said when he first got cut, it felt like he got punched. These are not the severe injuries that we're talking about when we talk about substantial bodily injury.

Now, I'm going to tell you none of this had to happen.

None of it. I don't know if it was because Global Security doesn't train their employees or if it was because Chase Lovato and William Allison just acted way outside their authority. But what I do know is Mr. Edwards was unjustifiably attacked and he did the only thing he

20

21

22

23

24

25

think.

could do: He defended himself.

So the State has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that he committed a crime. They also have the burden of proving that anything Mr. Edwards did was not in self-defense, and they have to prove that beyond a reasonable doubt. They didn't even come close on either one. And we ask you to find him not guilty on both counts. Thank you.

THE COURT: State, any rebuttal closing?

MS. DERJAVINA: Your Honor, may we approach?

THE COURT: Yes.

[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]

MS. DERJAVINA: Is there any way we can [indiscernible].

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. DERJAVINA: And [indiscernible] hour and a half, I

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. DERJAVINA: Thank you.

THE COURT: We'll be able to take our 15-minute recess.

MS. DERJAVINA: Thank you.

[End of bench conference.]

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to take a 15-minute recess. During this recess you are admonished not to talk or converse among yourselves or with anyone else on any subject connected with this trial, or read, watch, or listen to any report of or commentary on the trial or any person connected with

this trial by any medium of information, including, without limitation, newspapers, television, radio, or Internet, or form or express any opinion on any subject connected with the trial until the case is finally submitted to you.

We'll be in recess for 15 minutes.

[Court recessed at 2:23 p.m., until 2:39 p.m.]

[Outside the presence of the jury.]

THE COURT: Let the record -- wait. Before we bring the jury in, I just want to put a few things on the record.

Let the record reflect the presence of counsel for the State, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant.

It's my understanding the parties want the knife to go back with the jury as one of the exhibits; is that correct?

MR. DICKERSON: Correct.

MS. ODEH: Yes.

THE COURT: What I'm going to instruct the jury then is they can view the knife in the evidence box. However, they -- it's currently secured. If they want to take the knife out of the box, they're to contact the marshal. He will take it out of the box, he will remain there while they review it. And then he'll secure it back in the evidence box. Is there any problem with me instructing the jury on that?

MS. BROUWERS: No, Your Honor.

MR. DICKERSON: State's agreeable.

THE COURT: Okay. The other thing is I noticed the

1	parties are using PowerPoints. I think I may have mentioned this, if
2	I haven't, please make a copy of your PowerPoints and provide it to
3	my clerk after the conclusion of argument today, and I'll make it a
4	court exhibit.
5	MR. DICKERSON: Yes, Your Honor.
6	MS. ODEH: Okay.
7	THE COURT: Is there anything else before I bring the jury
8	in?
9	MR. DICKERSON: Nothing from the State.
10	MS. DERJAVINA: No, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
12	[Jury reconvened at 2:41 p.m.]
13	THE COURT: Let the record reflect the presence of
14	counsel for the State, counsel for the defendant, and the defendant.
15	Do the parties stipulate to the presence of the jury?
16	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.
17	MS. ODEH: Yes.
18	MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: State, any rebuttal closing argument?
20	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Thank you.
22	MS. DERJAVINA: Thank you.
23	THE COURT: You may proceed.
24	REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT FOR THE STATE
25	MS. DERJAVINA: Welcome back, everyone.

Now, the first thing I want to talk to you about is a jury instruction that you have that's kind of important, and we touched upon it during voir dire. It talks about sympathy. And that jury instruction specifically says:

A verdict may never be influenced by sympathy.

Now, we have information here and we've heard a lot about the fact that the defendant's homeless and he really wasn't doing anything initially, but trying to find a place to sleep. And I think as human beings, our hearts usually go out to people like that, somebody who don't have a home and have to sleep on the street, especially in the summer, when it's hot in Vegas.

But it's important that you remember that that jury instruction specifically says that your verdict may never be influenced by sympathy.

Now, I want to talk about a couple of things that Defense touched upon. The first thing is, obviously, saying that he did this all in self-defense. That's the reason he's justified in what he did. It was to defend himself. You have a very important jury instruction, because self-defense isn't always available. And one time that it's not available is when you're the initial aggressor.

So you're going to have a jury instruction, and it's Jury Instruction Number 23. And I know it's a little hard to read, because the letters are not big, but -- and you'll have this. But I want to touch upon the important thing that it says. And this says:

Self-defense is not available to an original aggressor, that

is a person who sought the quarrel with the design to force a deadly issue.

And the evidence in this case is very clear: The person who sought that quarrel initially, and that was the defendant.

So the first thing I want to talk about is the video. I won't show you the video over again. You've seen it several times, and most importantly, you're going to have it to look at.

What I do want to talk about, though, is what is in that video. Now, when you get the video, there's a lot of things are in it, a lot of files, and we've stickered some of them. So I want to kind of make it a little bit clearer for you, specifically what video you should be looking at.

So when you look at State's exhibit, and when you open up that CD with the video, there's going to be three files in them. Two that are actual file folders and one that's just a video. There's going to be specifically the Hawaiian Market file. And the video that we're talking -- video that shows exactly what happened in this case is this one right here, it's 20170618065651. And I want you to remember that number, if you want, you can write it down because I think it's important for you to know exactly what to look at.

Because as I said, that video is going to show it all.

Now, in that video, what you're going to see is that the defendant is sitting up, he's already awake, and that's the point that it starts. And I think that's the important point of where all of this turns.

Now, initially, you're going to see Allison -- Security

Officer Allison take something out. And Defense counsel said, Well,
I didn't see him reading anything. And I want you to pay attention,
because you can actually see at one point he is going to like this,
he's looking down. And what's he's doing is reading a trespass
statute. Because it's an actual statute that you have to read. And
you can see as he's doing that.

What you're also going to see is right after that, within seconds, we're not saying it was minutes, but Officer Lovato --Security Officer Lovato takes out his handcuffs. And if you remember, he said why he did that. Because he knew the interaction with the defendant at this -- this is going to be one of those situations where we're going to tell somebody to leave and they're going to leave. And you heard them talk about how, actually, earlier in the patrol, they already told a couple of people that you can't be here, you have to leave. But based on the interaction that they were having with the defendant, he already knew. And I'll talk about it a little bit, and you've seen the body cam, and we've seen how he was acting. It doesn't take a long while to realize that this isn't going to be something that somebody's going to go easy.

So you're going to see how Security Officer Lovato takes out those handcuffs. And I want you to pay close attention. You might have to play the video a couple of times. But what you're going to see right before that point, you're going to see in the right

hand of the defendant is what appears to be a white tissue or something white.

And as soon as Officer Lovato takes out those handcuffs, you can see that tissue is going to go from the right hand to the left. And you're going to see that right hand go in that -- to that pocket. And what is in that pocket? It's the knife.

And that's important. Because it shows what the defendant is thinking already. Nothing in going on. They're just asking him to leave and he took out handcuffs, because he's being aggressive. But nobody's taken out mace yet, nobody's done anything. And he already is going to that pocket where the knife is. And I think that's very important for you to pay attention to.

Then what you're going to see is at that point, as when that hand goes into that pocket, is when Officer Lovato actually takes out the mace. And that's important, because Defense counsel talked to you about how if you look in the video, you can't really -- and the angle, it's obvious that you can't tell it's a knife. Well, actually, if you look at the timeframes of when Officer Lovato takes out that mace and the fact that Defendant puts out his hand at exactly that time, it's obvious that he saw something there.

Additionally, if you look at the knife, and you'll have it in evidence with you, you'll be able to look at it, you're going to see the way that the defendant is sitting, it's pretty easy that you can tell from the angle that Officer Lovato is in, the butt of that knife.

And he said it was silver, and guess what? That's exactly the knife

 that the defendant took out when he stabbed them. So I want you to pay attention to that, I think that's very important.

Now, after that, what you're going to see is, now that Officer Lovato right away maced the defendant, he didn't, and he heard from him, is he gave him commands. And he -- what you're going to see, and you've seen, but again, you're going to have it closer, you're going to have time to actually look at it and look at it as many times as you want. And I think it's important that you do that, because what you are going to see is this is what Officer Lovato is doing the entire time, is going like this, the entire time. Why is he doing that? Because he knows there's that knife. The defendant's being aggressive. I've got to keep watch and make sure that nothing happens.

So it's not like all of a sudden he maced him out of nowhere. He took his time. We're not saying it was hours or minutes, but he took his time. And the time that he took out his mace to when he actually maced the defendant, what we see is Defendant get up, and again, Officer Lovato's looking there and he's, like, something's going on. He's got the knife, but -- and at the point that he maces and you heard from him is when -- and in the video you'll see this is the defendant right up front, this is Officer Allison, and it's when the defendant actually turns.

And you heard from Defense counsel say, Well, if he wasn't doing anything, he was trying to go to the street. And I implore you to take a good look at that video. Because it wasn't a

stance of, Hey, I'm leaving. It was a stance of something's about to go down. You can tell exactly from the body language.

Now, obviously, we don't have the sound, so we don't know what's going on. But we have how the defendant's acting a little while after. And if you put those two things together, it's very obvious exactly what the situation was. This is -- wasn't somebody who was just leaving. This was somebody starting to get aggressive and he still sees that knife.

And you heard from Officer Lovato. At that point he realized that this is imminent. Something's going to happen. And if I don't do anything, that my fellow security officer who I'm working with is going to get hurt.

And what you're going to see is he does mace him. It actually doesn't work the first time. He does it again. And what you're going to see in that video is the mace gets a little bit on Officer Allison, so he backs away. And now you heard Defense counsel say how, Well, the defendant, you know, he did take the knife out. They submit to that. But he put it in the back. Trying to make it seem like he put it -- like, oh, he's not using it. And again, I ask that you take a good look at that video. Because that's not what happened.

What he did is he went like this. And he's in a stance where he's ready to fight. It's not, Hey, I'm just, you know, having it in the back. Look at his body language. Look exactly what he's doing. Because it's obvious from that video exactly what he was

planning to do.

And then you heard from Officer Allison, he said, Well, at that point is when I didn't necessarily know that it was a knife.

Because one, he's got maced, and two, it is behind the defendant.

But he knew that it was a sharp weapon. And at that point he realized, have to do something.

And if you look at the video, it's not like he's charging -he's actually trying to kind of get behind the defendant. And the
reason he's doing it is he's trying to get into control; that's what
he's trying to do. He's trying to get control of his arms and get the
weapon out of his hands.

Unfortunately, that doesn't happen. The reason is because, as you saw, he got stabbed. And you can see very clear in the video. Once, it actually is the left, once right below the rib, and then again in the shoulder. He wasn't sure when the shoulder one happened, because he felt the first one and the second one he realized afterwards where he was, like, I got stabbed twice.

And then when Officer Lovato goes for help, he gets stabbed.

So the defendant doesn't get to start the whole thing and then say, Well, no, I was defending myself, they maced me. You don't get that right as the initial aggressor. And that's exactly what the defendant is. And that video shows exactly what happened.

And like I said, I ask that you take a good look at that video. We've shown it to you, but you'll have it in front of you. You

can take a very good look and see exactly how things took place.

So self-defense is not available. He doesn't get to claim self-defense.

Now, we have the video and, obviously, as I mentioned, the video doesn't really have sounds, so we don't hear what's going on. So we see what's going on. We kind of see the sequence of events, who's doing what at what point.

But what we do have is the body camera. And I think that's kind of important, and the reason is, as you heard, that happened a little while after. Officer Simms was actually one of the first responding officers. So he was there a little while after it happened. And you kind of get to see how the defendant's acting.

And you heard Officer Allison talk about how -- the way that he's acting right after -- because he happens to be in that security office at the same time. Fortunately, they don't split them up. It's exactly the way that he was acting when they first interacted him.

And you can see that from the way that he's acting, it doesn't take a long while to realize what's going on.

And I want to play a couple of snippets for you.

[Pause in proceedings.]

MS. DERJAVINA: That's fine. Thank you. There we go. [Video played.]

MS. DERJAVINA: Is there sound? [Video played.]

MS. DERJAVINA: This is the part where we hear him, You're slow, you can't fuck with me on your best day and my worst day.

And again, this is a little while after. This isn't somebody who was acting like he was scared. This is somebody saying, Hey, I beat you, you can't get me on my worst day.

[Video played.]

MS. DERJAVINA: Again, from his mouth, I tore his ass up too.

And now I want you to pay close attention to what happens.

[Video played.]

MS. DERJAVINA: What we just saw is another security officer who isn't Officer Allison or Officer Lovato just pass by the defendant. He's not saying anything to him, he's not doing anything. And what does he tell him:

And this faggot coming up talking all shit, I'll tear your ass in the sun.

So now, you can imagine exactly how he was acting with Officer Lovato and Officer Allison. This is the things that he was saying. Now, Defense counsel said how, What I didn't hear in that video was white honky, things like that. The things that you did hear and the things you'll hear, because you'll have this video and you'll get to hear it yourselves, Glazed donut, faggot, bitch. Those are the words the defendant's using.

And you just saw right here, right now, that security officer wasn't doing anything to him, wasn't provoking him, he's passed by, and those are the things that he tells him. So imagine what he's telling the officers who are just asking him to leave when he doesn't want to leave.

And I won't play all of this for you, because, like I said, you're going to have this video with you when you deliberate. And I ask that you listen to it. But I'll play this part, because I think it's very important for you to hear this.

[Video played.]

MS. DERJAVINA: What he just says is, They need to be well so they can come back to work, because I know where they at.

I want you to think about that. Think about, really, what's going through the defendant's mind. And like I said, you're going to have this entire video and you're going to hear it.

Now, there is a point where Defense counsel talked about how he says, Look at that, I weigh 125 pounds. You'll get to hear him say -- now, he actually says it several times. He's not saying it that, Hey, look at me, I weigh 125 pounds, they're much bigger than me, they're taller than me, and I was scared. He says it as, I'm 125 pounds and I tore their ass. That's how he's saying it, because he's proud of what he did. Because he's proud that he got to stab them and he's only 125 pounds.

So as I said, once you're the initial aggressor, you do not get to claim self-defense. That is not available to you, and that is

exactly what we have here.

The next thing I want to talk about is you have another jury instruction that talks about proportionate use. And that's going to be Instruction 27.

And I apologize, I know I keep switching back and forth.

And once that comes on the screen, you're going to see how it says: The law does not justify -- move it up a little bit -- the law does not justify the use of a greater degree of force than is reasonably necessary. A person acting in self-defense, and again, as I mentioned, outside of this, he doesn't get to claim self-defense, because he's the one who started it, he's the initial aggressor.

But even a person who's acting in self-defense is allowed to use force in proportionality, reasonable amount to avoid actual apparent danger.

What do we have here? We have Officer Allison and Officer Lovato. They have handcuffs, they have mace, and that's about it. And they also have their badge. What does the defendant have? He has the knife.

And you just heard Defense counsel concede that's a deadly weapon. That's not question about it. And that's what he used. There's no proportionate here. This is not a knife to a knife. And you heard them say they had no knife, they had no gun, they're security officers. They have a mace and then they have handcuffs. That's all they have.

So at the end of the day, he doesn't get to also say that,

because it's not proportionate, and self-defense, it has to be. So I want you to think about that instruction as you deliberate. I think that's very important.

Now, I want to talk about arrest. And you're going to have a jury instruction, and I think -- we talked a little bit about it during our closings, but I think it's important to go over it again. And that talks about when somebody can resist an arrest.

And, basically, there's two things that have to happen if it's a lawful arrest, for you to be able to. An arrest, he may physically resist arrest only if a peace officer makes the arrest, uses a force that is unlawful and excessive, and only the arrestee is facing imminent or serious bodily harm.

Somebody has to think he actually has to be facing imminent and serious bodily harm.

And we don't have that here. First of all, them wanting to arrest him for trespass, that was lawful. And you heard from them that they read him the trespass statute. And again, this goes back to the video where you get to see the video and decide whether he actually was refusing to leave. And I submit to you, yeah, he was. There's no question about him refusing to leave. It didn't have to be 30 minutes for them to talk to him to know that this isn't somebody who's refusing to leave. Because never do you see in the video where he tries to pout his shoes on or he does anything. There's actually a point in the video where he kind of gets up halfway, kind of in an aggressive way. And then he's, like, and he

slouches back down. That's obviously telling him, I am loose.

So them wanting to arrest him for trespassing was reasonable and not unlawful. But the moment that he took out that knife, as you heard them say, they also were going to detain him now, obviously, because he's got a deadly weapon. So that wasn't unlawful.

And it wasn't excessive. Macing somebody that you know has a knife, and we've talked about this. You get to see the video. He's got that knife and they actually saw it, I'm holding something. Officer Allison about how he can see that he's holding something. He can't see what it is. But based on the angle of Officer Lovato, he can see that it's a knife. It wasn't -- mace isn't excessive. It's not a deadly weapon.

Now, is I uncomfortable and is it painful when you get sprayed? Yes. But as you heard Officer Lovato talk, and I believe Officer Simms did too, on Defense's cross, that the point is that it's supposed to prevent the person from doing any other harm. It's supposed to debilitate you. You're supposed to kind of be not knowing what's going on, and that's the whole purpose of doing that. It wasn't to hurt him; it was to make sure they can get him under control, which, unfortunately, they weren't able to do that in time. They both suffered injuries by that point. So we don't have that.

So the way that I think I ask that you look at it is -- there's two, there's one, which is regular self-defense. He doesn't get

because he's initial aggressor. He also doesn't get it, because self-defense has to be proportionate. And it's obvious here that it wasn't.

But when there's an arrest involved, there's a different is that fair to self-defense. And here not only do we not have the regular self-defense, but we also don't have the one that talks about the arrest, because we don't have unlawful excessive force, and he wasn't facing imminent bodily harm. And it's not about he thought he was; it's he has to be facing it. I ask that you read the instruction, because it's very specific to that.

Now, I want to talk about substantial bodily harm.

Defense counsel talked about the fact that the victims weren't in the hospital for very long, that, you know, they didn't go back to the doctor, things like that. And we went over this, but I want to go over this jury instruction once again, because the law is very clear of what defines substantial bodily harm. And when you all were here and we asked you, like, once you're instructed by the law, are you willing to listen to it and read it.

The law is very clear and now we're not talking about permanent disfigurement, so we're clear. It's a scar, but we're not saying it's, like, a huge permanent. What we're saying is it's substantial bodily harm because there's prolonged pain.

And prolonged pain occurs when a victim experiences physical suffering or injury -- and this is important -- lasting longer than the immediate pain of the wrongful touching.

So what does that mean? And my co-counsel talked about it during our closing. If once they felt the pain just during the stab and that's it, yeah, there's no -- but they didn't. He doesn't -- they don't have to be facing -- I believe Defense counsel said they weren't facing life-threatening injuries. That's not the law. They don't have to be facing life-threatening injuries. And thankfully, in this case, that they weren't. It just has to be longer than the immediate pain of the wrongful touch.

And in this case, it was. For Officer Allison it was a month and a half, and you heard the fact that he wasn't able to pick it up, he wasn't able to move it around. For Chase Lovato, it was a couple of days. But the fact is that's substantial bodily harm.

Once they were stabbed and they felt a little while after that, that's substantial bodily harm by the law. They don't have to be in the hospital for days, they don't have to have life-threatening injuries. It just has to last longer.

And the fact is that Defense counsel is obviously trying to minimize their injuries. But this isn't a little cut or a little prick of a knife. This is a stab wound that went deep --

MS. ODEH: Objection. Judge, can we approach?

THE COURT: Counsel approach.

[Bench conference transcribed as follows.]

MS. ODEH: A stab wound that went deep.

MS. DERJAVINA: Well, I'm --

THE COURT: There was no testimony it went deep.

1	MS. DERJAVINA: Okay. Well, just, my next	
2	MR. DICKERSON: It's a reasonable inference from	
3	watching the video, seeing the blade of the knife, seeing it go all the	
4	way into the body.	
5	MS. DERJAVINA: And I'm also willing to argue that it had	
6	to they had to use an adhesive to put the skin together.	
7	MR. DICKERSON: It's argument.	
8	MS. DERJAVINA: Yeah.	
9	MS. ODEH: Judge, my position is they went ahead if	
10	they're going to talk about the nature of the injury and this in	
11	these terms	
12	MS. DERJAVINA: I'll reword it.	
13	MS. ODEH: it's not the doctor where he had to come	
14	in	
15	THE COURT: Okay. I'm just going to disregard the	
16	comment it went deep.	
17	MS. ODEH: Thank you.	
18	[End of bench conference.]	
19	THE COURT: Jury, disregard the comment it went deep.	
20	MS. BROUWERS: All right. I don't know if you need to	
21	say it again, because the static was still going.	
22	THE COURT: Jury, disregard the comment it went deep.	
23	MS. DERJAVINA: So I was saying, this isn't a tag, this	
24	isn't a little cut, this is a wound where even though, thankfully, they	
25	didn't need stitches, but they needed a thing to actually put the skin	

together.

And think about it this way: Even though it's not a permanent disfigurement, you don't get a scar from a little thing on a skin. And they still have it. And we're in -- have to think for a second -- we're in March of 2018, and they still have that scar. So that also tells you that this wasn't just a little scab on the skin. And that tells you the extent of that injury, and that is substantial bodily harm by the definition of the law.

And, finally, what I want to talk to you about is you have you have an instruction, and it talks about reasonable doubt. And I want to point out a little line in that instruction. And I want to -- because I think it's a very important instruction, I'm going to try to zoom in a little bit so you can see it. It says:

Doubt, to be reasonable, must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation.

And I want you to think about that when you're in the -deliberating on this case. Doubt, to be reasonable, must be actual,
not mere possibility or speculation.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, during this case, the evidence has shown to you beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant, Toyer Edwards, is guilty of two counts of battery with a deadly weapon resulting in substantial bodily harm. And we ask that you find him guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Clerk will now swear in the marshal and the -- my JEA.

[Officers sworn.]

THE COURT: Thank you.

The alternates in this case are Juror Number 13, Jerome Dickey, and Juror Number 14, Ronald Mullins. Those two jurors will -- are the alternates and will go with my judicial executive assistant. The remaining jurors, 1 through 12, the bailiff is going to take you to the jury deliberation room, at which time the exhibits will be brought to you, as well as the jury instructions.

I will advise you that one of the exhibits is the knife, and it's in a box. You can certainly view the knife. But it's in a secure position within that box. If you want to remove it from the box, you need to contact the marshal and he will remove it. And once you have viewed it outside the box, he is going to place it back in the box and secure it.

But for right now, it is going to be sent back with you in the box in a secure position, as well as all the other exhibits and the jury instructions.

At this time, the marshal will escort you to the jury deliberation room.

[Jury recessed for deliberation at 3:10 p.m.]

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, you have provided my clerk with telephone numbers which you can be reached. Obviously, don't go too far away. Be within 15-20 minutes.

MS. DERJAVINA: And, Your Honor, we're waiting, unfortunately, the laptop we have right now doesn't have a clean

1	option. Should I just texted my IT person and asked her to bring,
2	like, one that doesn't have anything on it.
3	THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
4	We'll be in recess.
5	MR. DICKERSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
6	MS. DERJAVINA: Thank you.
7	[Court recessed at 3:11 p.m., until 4:09 p.m.]
8	[Outside the presence of the jury.]
9	THE COURT: Okay. Recalling State of Nevada versus
10	Toyer Edwards, Case Number C-17-324805. Let the record reflect
11	the presence of counsel for the State, counsel for the defendant,
12	and do you waive the defendant's presence?
13	MS. BROUWERS: Yes, Your Honor.
14	MS. ODEH: Yes.
15	THE COURT: The Court has received a note from the jury
16	with a question. The first question is:
17	Are we allowed to review testimony from the prelim
18	hearing (more specifically, Allison's testimony).
19	The second question is:
20	Can we see a copy of the trespass statute?
21	And it's from Juror Number 9, Tamara Ouellette.
22	After conferring with counsel for the State and the
23	Defense, I've been provided an answer by counsel, which as to
24	Question Number 1, the Court is not at liberty to supplement the
25	evidence. And Question Number 2, you have been instructed on

1	the law, please refer to the jury selection.
2	Are both these answers acceptable to the State?
3	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: All right. Are both these answers acceptable
5	to the Defense?
6	MS. ODEH: Yes, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: What I'm going to do, then, is tape this
8	question to a piece of paper. Below it, I will have the answers
9	typed. And then I will sign it and send it back to the jury. Is that
10	acceptable?
11	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.
12	MS. BROUWERS: Yes.
13	MS. ODEH: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Thank you.
15	[Court recessed at 4:11 p.m., until 5:20 p.m.]
16	[In the presence of the jury.]
17	THE COURT: This is the continuation of the trial State of
18	Nevada versus Toyer Edwards, Case Number C-17-324805. Let the
19	record reflect the presence of counsel for the State, counsel for the
20	defendant, and the defendant.
21	Will the parties stipulate to the presence of the jury?
22	MS. DERJAVINA: Yes, Your Honor.
23	MS. ODEH: Yes, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: Thank you.
25	Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, have you chosen a

1	foreperson? And if so, who is that person?	
2	Have all and your name is?	
3	JUROR NO. 9: Tamara Ouellette.	
4	THE COURT: And your badge number? Oh, you don't	
5	have it?	
6	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She's Number 9, Your Honor.	
7	JUROR NO. 9: 0787.	
8	THE COURT: Thank you. I apologize.	
9	Have all the members of the jury reached a unanimous	
10	verdict as to the charges presented to them? Ma'am?	
11	JUROR NO. 9: Yes.	
12	THE COURT: Thank you.	
13	Please give the verdict form to the marshal, please.	
14	Thank you.	
15	The clerk will now read the verdict of the jury.	
16	THE COURT CLERK: District Court, Clark County, Nevada,	
17	State of Nevada, Plaintiff, Case Number C-324805, Toyer Edwards,	
18	Defendant, verdict.	
19	We, the jury, in the above-entitled case find the defendant	
20	Toyer Edwards as follows:	
21	Count 1, Guilty of Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon	
22	Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm.	
23	Count 2, Guilty of Battery with Use of a Deadly Weapon	
24	Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm.	
25	Dated this second day of March, 2018, Tamara Ouellette,	

1	Foreperson.
2	Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, are these your verdicts
3	as read, so say you one, so say you all?
4	THE JURY: Yes.
5	THE COURT: Does either party wish to have the jury
6	individually polled?
7	MS. BROUWERS: Yes.
8	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 1, is this your
9	verdict are these your verdicts as read?
10	JUROR NO. 1: Yes.
11	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 2, are these your
12	verdicts as read?
13	JUROR NO. 2: Yes.
14	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 3, are these your
15	verdicts as read?
16	JUROR NO. 3: Yes.
17	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 4, are these your
18	verdicts as read?
19	JUROR NO. 4: Yes.
20	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 5, are these your
21	verdicts as read?
22	JUROR NO. 5: Yes.
23	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 6 are these your
24	verdicts as read?
25	JUROR NO. 6: Yes.

1	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 7, are these your
2	verdicts as read?
3	JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
4	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 8, are these your
5	verdicts as read?
6	JUROR NO. 8: Yes.
7	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 9, are these your
8	verdicts as read?
9	JUROR NO. 9: Yes.
10	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 10, are these your
11	verdicts as read?
12	JUROR NO. 10: Yes.
13	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 11, are these your
14	verdicts as read?
15	JUROR NO. 11: Yes.
16	THE COURT CLERK: Juror Number 12, are these your
17	verdicts as read?
18	JUROR NO. 12: Yes.
19	THE COURT: The verdict of the jury shall now be
20	recorded in the minutes of the court.
21	Ladies and gentlemen, as you know, the right to a trial by
22	jury is one of our basic and fundamental constitutional guarantees.
23	I firmly believe in this right, that is the right of every person accused
24	with a crime to be judged by a fair and impartial jury.
25	lury service is something that many persons shirk from

They do not wish to become involved. That's why I'm so pleased that you 14 men and women have been willing to give your valuable time. You have been most attentive and most conscientious. On behalf of counsel, the parties, and the Eighth Judicial District Court, I wish to thank you for your careful deliberation which you gave to this case.

The question may now arise as to whether you may now talk to other persons regarding this matter. I advise you that you may, if you wish, talk to other persons and discuss your deliberations which you gave to this case. You are not required to do so, however. I will be available shortly to speak to you if you so desire. And if any person persists in discussing this case after you have indicated that you do not wish to do so or raises objections as to your result or as to how you deliberate, you may report that fact directly to me.

I truly appreciate you all serving. I know it was in many instances away from your job or your family. And I think I speak on behalf of all parties involved in this case, we appreciate when people in the community, such as yourselves, gives up their time to serve on a jury.

Many times after a trial, when I was an attorney, it was always helpful to speak to the jurors to get their insights, since I had never served on a jury. So counsel may approach you after the case to speak with you. That is entirely your call if you want to talk to them. Really, what they're trying to do is just give a -- get some

1	insight as to how you arrived at your verdict and maybe	
2	suggestions from you what they could or could not have done	
3	better in the case.	
4	But again, if you don't want to talk to anybody about your	
5	verdict, you do not have to. If somebody persists in talking to you	
6	and you don't want to, please report it to me.	
7	I'll make myself available a few minutes afterwards if you	
8	want to talk to me in the jury deliberation room, or you can just	
9	leave. You can just go home to your families and with our deep	
10	appreciation.	
11	At this time, the jury is excused with the thanks of the	
12	Court and counsel. Thank you.	
13	[Jury dismissed at 5:26 p.m.]	
14	THE COURT: Defense, do you want to be heard on	
15	custody status?	
16	MS. BROUWERS: We'll submit it, Your Honor.	
17	THE COURT: The defendant is remanded to custody and	
18	will remain in custody it'll the sentencing date.	
19	Mr. Castle, we'll need an in-custody sentencing date.	
20	THE COURT CLERK: April 26, 9:00 a.m.	
21	MR. DICKERSON: Thank you.	
22	MS. DERJAVINA: Thank you.	
23	THE COURT: Anything further that needs to be brought to	
24	the attention of the Court?	
25	MS. DERJAVINA: No, Your Honor.	
	105	

1	MR. DICKERSON: No, Your Honor. Just that we
2	understand it's late on a Friday. They probably don't want to talk to
3	us. If they want our contact information, we have cards here, but
4	THE COURT: And then when I was an attorney, they used
5	to have to go down to the third floor to get paid. It's my
6	understanding that they now will mail the check. So if you want to
7	try going down to the third floor, see if anybody goes by, that's
8	entirely your call.
9	I doubt if anybody's going to be back there, even to talk at
10	all.
11	MR. DICKERSON: Right.
12	THE COURT: So again, at this point, we'll be in recess.
13	MR. DICKERSON: Thank you.
14	MS. DERJAVINA: Thank you.
15	MR. DICKERSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
17	MR. DICKERSON: Thank you everybody.
18	[Court adjourned at 5:28 p.m.]
19	///
20	
21	
22	ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly
23	transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled case to the best of my ability.
24	Shawna Ortega, CET*562
0.5	Silawila Oitega, CL 1 302

Electronically Filed 3/2/2018 9:12 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	PHILIP J. KOHN, PUBLIC DEFENDER	Oten S. Stuns
2	NEVADA BAR NO. 0556 ELAINE ODEH, DEPUTY PUBLIC DEFI	ENDER
3	NEVADA BAR NO. 14099	
3	SHANA S. BROUWERS, DEPUTY PUBL NEVADA BAR NO. 12337	LIC DEFENDER
4	PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE	
5	309 South Third Street, Suite 226 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155	
6	Telephone: (702) 455-4685	
	Facsimile: (702) 455-5112 elaine.odeh@clarkcountynv.gov	
7	shana.brouwers@clarkcountynv.gov Attorneys for Defendant	
8		EDICE COURT
9	DIS	TRICT COURT
10	CLARK	COUNTY, NEVADA
	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)
11	Plaintiff,) CASE NO. C-17-324805-1
12	Tiamuii,)
13	V.) DEPT. NO. XVIII
4	TOYER EDWARDS,	ý
	Defendant,)
15		_)
16	DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMEN	TAL PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS
17		
18	COMES NOW, the Defendant, 1	TOYER EDWARDS, by and through his attorneys,
19	ELAINE ODEH and SHANA BROUWEI	RS, Deputy Public Defenders, and hereby submits the
	following proposed jury instructions and ve	erdict form.
20	DATED this 2 nd day of March, 2018	8.
21	-	PHILIP J. KOHN
22		CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER
23		
24		By: /c/Flaina Odah
		By: <u>/s/Elaine Odeh</u> ELAINE ODEH, #14099
25		Deputy Public Defender
26		
27		
28		

INSTRUCTION NO.	
INSTRUCTION NO.	

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant committed each

and every element of the offense of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in

Substantial Bodily Harm, then Defendant is "Not Guilty" of Battery With Use of a Deadly

Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm.

<u>Crawford v. State</u>, 121 Nev. 744, 753 (2005). ("...this court [Supreme Court of Nevada] has consistently recognized that specific jury instructions that remind the jurors that they may not convict the defendant if proof of a particular element is lacking should be given upon request.").

INSTRUCTION NO.	
INSTRUCTION NO.	

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant committed each

and every element of the offense of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon, then Defendant

is "Not Guilty" of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon.

<u>Crawford v. State</u>, 121 Nev. 744, 753 (2005). ("...this court [Supreme Court of Nevada] has consistently recognized that specific jury instructions that remind the jurors that they may not convict the defendant if proof of a particular element is lacking should be given upon request.").

INSTRUCTION NO.	
INSTRUCTION NO.	

<u>Crawford v. State</u>, 121 Nev. 744, 753 (2005). ("...this court [Supreme Court of Nevada] has consistently recognized that specific jury instructions that remind the jurors that they may not convict the defendant if proof of a particular element is lacking should be given upon request.").

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant committed each

and every element of the crime of Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm, then

Defendant is "Not Guilty" of Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm.

INSTRUCTION NO.	
-----------------	--

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant committed each

and every element of the crime of Battery, you must find the Defendant "Not Guilty."

<u>Crawford v. State</u>, 121 Nev. 744, 753 (2005). ("...this court [Supreme Court of Nevada] has consistently recognized that specific jury instructions that remind the jurors that they may not convict the defendant if proof of a particular element is lacking should be given upon request.").

INSTRUCTION NO.	
-----------------	--

The State has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt every element of the crime charged. The Defendant is presumed innocent. Accordingly, the Defendant does not have to call witnesses to testify on his behalf. If the Defendant does not call witnesses on his behalf, you are instructed not to discuss this fact or permit it to influence your deliberations in any way.

Crawford v. State, 121 Nev. 744, 121 P.3d 582 (2005).

1	VER		
2	DISTRICT COURT		
3	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
4	THE STATE OF NEVADA,		
5	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C-17-324805-1	
6	v.)	DEPT. NO. XVIII	
7	TOYER EDWARDS,		
8	Defendant.		
9			
10	$\underline{\mathbf{VER}}$	<u>DICT</u>	
11	We, the jury in the above-captioned c	ase, find the Defendant, TOYER EDWARDS,	
12	as follows:		
13 14	COUNT 1 – BATTERY WITH USE OF A SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (as to V		
15	(Please check the appropriate box, select only one) ☐ NOT GUILTY		
16	☐ Guilty of BATTERY		
17	☐ Guilty of BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON ☐ Guilty of BATTERY RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM		
18	☐ Guilty of BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM		
19			
20	COUNT 2 – BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (as to Chase Lovato)		
21	(Please check the appropriate box, select only one) ☐ NOT GUILTY		
22	☐ Guilty of BATTERY		
23	☐ Guilty of BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON ☐ Guilty of BATTERY RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM		
24	☐ Guilty of BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM		
25		_day of March, 2018.	
26		,,	
27			
28		FOREPERSON	

Electronically Filed 3/2/2018 9:17 AM Steven D. Grierson CLERK OF THE COURT

1	PHILIP J. KOHN, PUBLIC DEFENDER	Otens. Dun
2	NEVADA BAR NO. 0556 ELAINE ODEH, DEPUTY PUBLIC DEFI NEVADA BAR NO. 14099	ENDER
3	SHANA S. BROUWERS, DEPUTY PUBI NEVADA BAR NO. 12337	LIC DEFENDER
4	PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE 309 South Third Street, Suite 226	
5	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 Telephone: (702) 455-4685	
6	Facsimile: (702) 455-5112 elaine.odeh@clarkcountynv.gov	
7	shana.brouwers@clarkcountynv.gov Attorneys for Defendant	
8		TRICT COURT
9	CLARK	COUNTY, NEVADA
10	THE STATE OF NEVADA,)
11	Plaintiff,) CASE NO. C-17-324805-1
12	v.)) DEPT. NO. XVIII
13	TOYER EDWARDS,))
1415	Defendant,)))
16	DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMEN	STAL PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS
17	COMES NOW, the Defendant, '	TOYER EDWARDS, by and through his attorneys,
18 19	ELAINE ODEH and SHANA BROUWE	CRS, Deputy Public Defenders, and hereby submits the
20	following proposed jury instructions and ve	erdict form.
21	DATED this 3 rd day of March, 2018	8.
22		PHILIP J. KOHN CLARK COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER
23		CLARK COUNTT FUBLIC DEFENDER
24		Ry: /s/Flaine Odeh
25		By: /s/Elaine Odeh ELAINE ODEH, #14099 Deputy Public Defender
26		Deputy I done Detender
27		
28		
ı	1	

INSTRUCTION NO.	
INSTRUCTION NO.	

<u>Crawford v. State</u>, 121 Nev. 744, 753 (2005). ("...this court [Supreme Court of Nevada] has consistently recognized that specific jury instructions that remind the jurors that they may not convict the defendant if proof of a particular element is lacking should be given upon request.").

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant committed each

and every element of the offense of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in

Substantial Bodily Harm, you must find Defendant "Not Guilty" of Battery With Use of a

Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm.

INSTRUCT	ION NO	
	ICHN INCL.	

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant committed each and every element of the offense of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon, you must find Defendant "Not Guilty" of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon.

<u>Crawford v. State</u>, 121 Nev. 744, 753 (2005). ("...this court [Supreme Court of Nevada] has consistently recognized that specific jury instructions that remind the jurors that they may not convict the defendant if proof of a particular element is lacking should be given upon request.").

INSTRUCTION NO.	
INSTRUCTION NO.	

<u>Crawford v. State</u>, 121 Nev. 744, 753 (2005). ("...this court [Supreme Court of Nevada] has consistently recognized that specific jury instructions that remind the jurors that they may not convict the defendant if proof of a particular element is lacking should be given upon request.").

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant committed each

and every element of the crime of Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm, you must

find Defendant "Not Guilty" of Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm.

INSTRUCTION NO.	
-----------------	--

<u>Crawford v. State</u>, 121 Nev. 744, 753 (2005). ("...this court [Supreme Court of Nevada] has consistently recognized that specific jury instructions that remind the jurors that they may not convict the defendant if proof of a particular element is lacking should be given upon request.").

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant committed each

and every element of the crime of Battery, you must find the Defendant "Not Guilty."

INSTRUCTION NO.	
-----------------	--

The State has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt every element of the crime charged. The defendant is presumed innocent. Accordingly, the defendant does not have to call witnesses to testify on his behalf. If the Defendant does not call witnesses on his behalf, you are instructed not to discuss this fact or permit it to influence your deliberations in any way.

Crawford v. State, 121 Nev. 744, 121 P.3d 582 (2005).

1	VER		
2	DISTRICT COURT		
3	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
4	THE STATE OF NEVADA,		
5	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C-17-324805-1	
6	v.)	DEPT. NO. XVIII	
7	TOYER EDWARDS,		
8	Defendant.		
9			
10	$\underline{\mathbf{VER}}$	<u>DICT</u>	
11	We, the jury in the above-captioned c	ase, find the Defendant, TOYER EDWARDS,	
12	as follows:		
13 14	COUNT 1 – BATTERY WITH USE OF A		
15	SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (as to William Allison) (Please check the appropriate box, select only one)		
16	☐ NOT GUILTY ☐ Guilty of BATTERY		
17	☐ Guilty of BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON		
18	☐ Guilty of BATTERY RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM ☐ Guilty of BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON		
19	RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM		
20	COUNT 2 – BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (as to Chase Lovato)		
21	(Please check the appropriate box, select only one)		
22	☐ NOT GUILTY ☐ Guilty of BATTERY		
23	☐ Guilty of BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON ☐ Guilty of BATTERY RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM		
24	☐ Guilty of BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM		
25		_day of March, 2018.	
26	Duted tino		
27			
28		FOREPERSON	

28

FILED IN OPEN COURT STEVEN D. GRIERSON CLERK OF THE COURT

MAR 2 - 2018

BY DEPUTY

DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

THE STATE OF NEVADA,

Plaintiff,

-VS-

INST

TOYER EDWARDS,

Defendant.

CASE NO: C324805

DEPT NO: XVIII

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY (INSTRUCTION NO. I)

MEMBERS OF THE JURY:

It is now my duty as judge to instruct you in the law that applies to this case. It is your duty as jurors to follow these instructions and to apply the rules of law to the facts as you find them from the evidence.

You must not be concerned with the wisdom of any rule of law stated in these instructions. Regardless of any opinion you may have as to what the law ought to be, it would be a violation of your oath to base a verdict upon any other view of the law than that given in the instructions of the Court.

C = 17 = 324805 = 1 INST Instructions to the Jury 4725800



V

If, in these instructions, any rule, direction or idea is repeated or stated in different ways, no emphasis thereon is intended by me and none may be inferred by you. For that reason, you are not to single out any certain sentence or any individual point or instruction and ignore the others, but you are to consider all the instructions as a whole and regard each in the light of all the others.

The order in which the instructions are given has no significance as to their relative importance.

An Information is but a formal method of accusing a person of a crime and is not of itself any evidence of his guilt.

In this case, it is charged in an Information that on or about the 18th day of June, 2017, the Defendant committed the offenses of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm.

It is the duty of the jury to apply the rules of law contained in these instructions to the facts of the case and determine whether or not the Defendant is guilty one or more of the offenses charged.

COUNT 1 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM

did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously use force or violence upon the person of another, to wit: WILLIAM ALLISON, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a knife, by stabbing and/or cutting the said WILLIAM ALLISON with said knife, resulting in substantial bodily harm to WILLIAM ALLISON.

COUNT 2 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM

did willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously use force or violence upon the person of another, to wit: CHASE LOVATO, with use of a deadly weapon, to wit: a knife, by stabbing and/or cutting the said CHASE LOVATO with said knife, resulting in substantial bodily harm to CHASE LOVATO.

П

To constitute the crime charged, there must exist a union or joint operation of an act forbidden by law and an intent to do the act.

The intent with which an act is done is shown by the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

Do not confuse intent with motive. Motive is what prompts a person to act. Intent refers only to the state of mind with which the act is done.

Motive is not an element of the crime charged and the State is not required to prove a motive on the part of the Defendant in order to convict. However, you may consider evidence of motive or lack of motive as a circumstance in the case.



The Defendant is presumed innocent unless the contrary is proved. This presumption places upon the State the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt every element of the crime charged and that the Defendant is the person who committed the offense.

A reasonable doubt is one based on reason. It is not mere possible doubt but is such a doubt as would govern or control a person in the more weighty affairs of life. If the minds of the jurors, after the entire comparison and consideration of all the evidence, are in such a condition that they can say they feel an abiding conviction of the truth of the charge, there is not a reasonable doubt. Doubt to be reasonable must be actual, not mere possibility or speculation.

If you have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the Defendant, he is entitled to a verdict of not guilty.

INSTRUCTION NO. _ U

The Defendant does not have to testify or present any evidence to prove innocence. The State has the burden of proving every element of the charges beyond a reasonable doubt.

You are here to determine the guilt or innocence of the Defendant from the evidence in the case. You are not called upon to return a verdict as to the guilt or innocence of any other person. So, if the evidence in the case convinces you beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the Defendant, you should so find, even though you may believe one or more persons are also guilty.



The evidence which you are to consider in this case consists of the testimony of the witnesses, the exhibits, and any facts admitted or agreed to by counsel.

There are two types of evidence; direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is the testimony of a person who claims to have personal knowledge of the commission of the crime which has been charged, such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is the proof of a chain of facts and circumstances which tend to show whether the Defendant is guilty or not guilty. The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. Therefore, all of the evidence in the case, including the circumstantial evidence, should be considered by you in arriving at your verdict.

Statements, arguments and opinions of counsel are not evidence in the case. However, if the attorneys stipulate to the existence of a fact, you must accept the stipulation as evidence and regard that fact as proved.

You must not speculate to be true any insinuations suggested by a question asked a witness. A question is not evidence and may be considered only as it supplies meaning to the answer.

You must disregard any evidence to which an objection was sustained by the court and any evidence ordered stricken by the court.

Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must also be disregarded.

The credibility or believability of a witness should be determined by his manner upon the stand, his relationship to the parties, his fears, motives, interests or feelings, his opportunity to have observed the matter to which he testified, the reasonableness of his statements and the strength or weakness of his recollections.

If you believe that a witness has lied about any material fact in the case, you may disregard the entire testimony of that witness or any portion of his testimony which is not proved by other evidence.

Battery means any willful and unlawful use of force or violence upon the person of another.

The force used by the defendant need not be violent or severe, and need not cause bodily pain or bodily harm. Any slight touching by the defendant upon the person of another suffices, as long as the touching was intentional and unwanted.

The word "willfully", when applied to the intent with which an act is done, implies simply a purpose or willingness to commit the act in question. It does not require in its meaning that the defendant held any intent to violate any law, or to injure another, or to acquire any advantage.

If you find the Defendant is guilty of Battery, you must also determine whether a deadly weapon was used in the commission of the Battery. A "deadly weapon" is

- (a) Any instrument which, if used in the ordinary manner contemplated by its design and construction, will or is likely to cause substantial bodily harm or death;
- (b) Any weapon, device, instrument, material or substance which, under the circumstances in which it is used, attempted to be used or threatened to be used, is readily capable of causing substantial bodily harm or death

If you find the Defendant is guilty of Battery, regardless of whether you find a Deadly Weapon was used, you must determine whether the force used in the Battery resulted in substantial bodily harm to the victim. The Defendant need not have intended to cause substantial bodily harm to be liable for substantial bodily harm resulting from the Battery.

"Substantial bodily harm" means

- Bodily injury which creates a substantial risk of death or which causes serious, permanent disfigurement or protracted loss or impairment of the function of any bodily member or organ; or
 - 2. Prolonged physical pain.

"Prolonged" pain occurs where the victim experiences physical suffering or injury lasting longer that the immediate pain of the wrongful touching.

INSTRUCTION NO. 13

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant committed each and every element of the offense of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm, then Defendant is not guilty of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm.

.,

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant committed each and every element of the offense of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon, then Defendant is not guilty of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon.

-

If the State fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Defendant committed each and every element of the crime of Battery, you must find the Defendant "Not Guilty."

	. 1
INSTRUCTION NO.	11

An owner or occupant of land or building may make an oral or written demand of any person on the property to vacate the property. Any person who, after been given such demand, remains upon the land or in the building, is trespassing.

An arrest is the taking of a person into custody, in a case and in the manner authorized by law. An arrest may be made by a peace officer or by a private person.

A private person may arrest another for a public offense committed or attempted in the person's presence. Trespassing is a public offense.

A private person, when arresting another, may use force that is necessary and reasonable to secure the arrest under the circumstances.

An arrestee may physically resist arrest only if the peace officer or private person making the arrest uses force that is unlawful and excessive and only if the arrestee is facing imminent and serious bodily harm at the hands of peace officer or private person making the arrest.

Lawful resistance to the commission of a public offense may be made by a party about to be injured. Resistance sufficient to prevent the offense may be made by the person about to be injured and/or by other parties.

.2

.,

The use of force in self-defense is justified and not unlawful when the person who uses such force actually and reasonably believes:

- That there is imminent danger that the assailant will cause him great bodily injury; and
- That it is absolutely necessary under the circumstances for him to use in selfdefense force for the purpose of avoiding great bodily injury to himself.

A bare fear of death or great bodily injury is not sufficient to justify force. To justify such a force, the circumstances must be sufficient to excite the fears of a reasonable person placed in a similar situation. The person using said force must act under the influence of those fears alone.

However, actual danger is not necessary to justify the use of force in self-defense. A person has a right to defend from apparent danger to the same extent as he would from actual danger. The person is justified if:

- He is confronted by the appearance of imminent danger which arouses in his mind
 an honest belief and fear that he is about to suffer great bodily injury; and
- 2. He acts solely upon those appearances and his fear and actual beliefs;
- A reasonable person in a similar situation would believe himself to be in like danger.

The acts of self-defense are justified even if it develops afterwards that the person was mistaken about the extent of the danger.

Self-defense is not available to an original aggressor, that is, a person who has sought quarrel with the design to force a deadly issue and this through his fraud, contrivance or fault, to create a real or apparent necessity for making a felonious assault.

However, where a person, without voluntarily seeking, provoking, inviting, or willingly engaging in a difficulty of the person's own free will, is attacked by another and it is necessary for one to use force against another to protect himself, then the person need not flee for safety, but has the right to stand one's ground and use force against the other person.

If evidence of self-defense is present, the State of Nevada must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the Defendant did not act in self-defense. If you find the State of Nevada has failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the Defendant did not act in self-defense, you must find the Defendant "Not Guilty."



A person may use force in defense of others to the same extent that the person could have used force in self-defense.

.,

The right of self-defense exists only as long as the real or apparent threatened danger continues to exist. When such danger ceases to appear to exist, the right to use force in self-defense ends.

The law does not justify the use of a greater degree of force than is reasonably necessary. A person acting in self-defense is allowed to use force in a proportionately reasonable amount to avoid actual or apparent danger.

It is a constitutional right of a defendant in a criminal trial that he may not be compelled to testify. Thus, the decision as to whether he should testify is left to the defendant on the advice and counsel of his attorney. You must not draw any inference of guilt from the fact that he does not testify nor should this fact be discussed by you or enter into your deliberations in any way.



A portion of the video/audio contained in State's Exhibit 2 has been redacted, as it contained irrelevant and/or inadmissible evidence. You are not to infer anything from said redaction or consider it in your deliberations.

Although you are to consider only the evidence in the case in reaching a verdict, you must bring to the consideration of the evidence your everyday common sense and judgment as reasonable men and women. Thus, you are not limited solely to what you see and hear as the witnesses testify. You may draw reasonable inferences from the evidence which you feel are justified in the light of common experience, keeping in mind that such inferences should not be based on speculation or guess.

A verdict may never be influenced by sympathy, prejudice or public opinion. Your decision should be the product of sincere judgment and sound discretion in accordance with these rules of law.

In your deliberation you may not discuss or consider the subject of punishment, as that is a matter which lies solely with the court. Your duty is confined to the determination of the guilt or innocence of the Defendant.

During the course of this trial, and your deliberations, you are not to:

- communicate with anyone in any way regarding this case or its merits-either by phone, text, Internet, or other means;
- (2) read, watch, or listen to any news or media accounts or commentary about the case;
- (3) do any research, such as consulting dictionaries, using the Internet, or using reference materials;
- (4) make any investigation, test a theory of the case, re-create any aspect of the case, or in any other way investigate or learn about the case on your own.

When you retire to consider your verdict, you must select one of your member to act as foreperson who will preside over your deliberation and will be your spokesperson here in court.

During your deliberation, you will have all the exhibits which were admitted into evidence, these written instructions and forms of verdict which have been prepared for your convenience.

Your verdict must be unanimous. As soon as you have agreed upon a verdict, have it signed and dated by your foreperson and then return with it to this room.

If, during your deliberation, you should desire to be further informed on any point of law or hear again portions of the testimony, you must reduce your request to writing signed by the foreperson. The officer will then return you to court where the information sought will be given you in the presence of, and after notice to, the district attorney and the Defendant and his/her counsel.

Playbacks of testimony are time-consuming and are not encouraged unless you deem it a necessity. Should you require a playback, you must carefully describe the testimony to be played back so that the court recorder can arrange his/her notes. Remember, the court is not at liberty to supplement the evidence.

3 4 5

Now you will listen to the arguments of counsel who will endeavor to aid you to reach a proper verdict by refreshing in your minds the evidence and by showing the application thereof to the law; but, whatever counsel may say, you will bear in mind that it is your duty to be governed in your deliberation by the evidence as you understand it and remember it to be and by the law as given to you in these instructions, with the sole, fixed and steadfast purpose of doing equal and exact justice between the Defendant and the State of Nevada.

GIVEN:

DISTRICT JUDGI

1	VER	FILED IN OPEN COURT STEVEN D. GRIERSON	
2		CLERK OF THE COURT	
3		MAR 2 - 2018	
4		BY Defendant)	
5	DIETRIA	ALAN PAUL CASTLE, SR, DEPUTY	
6	DISTRICT COURT CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
7	THE STATE OF NEVADA,		
8	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. 0224805	
9	-vs-	CASE NO: C324805	
10	TOYER EDWARDS,	DEPT NO: XVIII	
11	Defendant.		
12	VERDICT		
13	We, the jury in the above entitled case, find the Defendant TOYER EDWARDS, as		
14	follows:		
15	COUNT 1 - BATTERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON RESULTING IN		
16	SUBSTANTIAL BODILY HARM (William Allison)		
17	(Please check the appropriate box, select only one)		
18	☐ Not Guilty		
19	☐ Guilty of Battery		
20	☐ Guilty of Battery With Use of a Deadly Weapon		
21	☐ Guilty of Battery Resulting in Substantial Bodily Harm		
22	Guilty of Battery With U Bodily Harm	se of a Deadly Weapon Resulting in Substantial	
23	Douny traini		
24	///		
25	///	C - 17 - 324805 - 1	
26	///	VER Vordic1 4725889	
27	///		
28	 ///		